THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

MRS. ROBERT CARLTON MORRIS ROBERT M. SMITH WILLIAM T. HASTINGS

Advisory Board

JOSEPH Q. ADAMS HARDIN CRAIG WILLIAM ALLAN NEILSON

VOL. 15 JULY, 1940 NO. 3

CONTENTS

PAGE

Baudelaire and Shakspere ..... *Max I. Baym* 131

William Shakspere, Botanist ..... *Phyllis Cook* 149

Shakspere and Music ..... *Mario Castelnuovo-Tedesco* 166

The Continuity of Shaksperian Prose ..... *Henry W. Wells* 175

The Roaring Boy in Tudor and Stuart Literature ..... *Burton Milligan* 184

A Note on 2 Henry IV ..... *Russell K. Alspach* 191

Published quarterly, in January, April, July, and October, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., 601 West 113th Street, New York.

Subscription rate, $2.00 per year, postpaid. Single copies, fifty cents.

Membership in the Association includes annual subscription.

All correspondence relating to the conduct of the BULLETIN should be addressed to Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum, 601 West 113th Street, New York, N. Y.

Other matters relating to the work of the Association should be referred to the Secretary.

Copyright, 1937, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

BAUDELAIRE AND SHAKSPERE

By MAX I. BAYM

THE story of Shakspere in France is a long one, and by this time an old one.[1] What English critics have thought of French criticisms of Shakspere is another matter. I can only pause to indicate here that Coleridge for example, to whom Baudelaire is poetically indebted, thought that French criticisms of the Bard were "the judgment of monkeys, by some wonderful phenomenon put into the mouths of people shaped like men."[2]

Extremists and insular bias aside, French criticisms of, and reactions to, Shakspere have always been interesting and sometimes important. What is surprising is the absence of Baudelaire's name in the history of these criticisms and reactions, especially between 1820 (*circa*), the year of the opening of the Romantic revival in drama, and 1870, a period corresponding to the life-course of the author of *Fleurs du Mal.* True, he never wrote a separate essay or study of Shakspere, but that he was pre-occupied with, and influenced, by him is clear enough, as will appear from what follows in the present paper.

I.

Baudelaire was fully aware of the whole course of French criticism of Shakspere, starting with Voltaire and running through Villemain and Victor Hugo. Of the first he said Emerson might have written a fine chapter entitled "Voltaire,[3] ou l'anti-poëte, le roi des badauds, le prince des superficiels"[4]; of the second, that he belonged to the clan of "pédagogues ignorants"[5] and that his *Cours de littérature* was a "banal compendium worthy of a professor of rhetoric.[6]What he had to say of Victor Hugo we shall see later.

Among his early literary admirations was Chateaubriand, whose essay entitled *Shakspere ou Shakespeare* (1801) he unquestionably had read. Indeed, Baudelaire's essay on laughter (*De l'Essence du Rire*) owes a good deal to the essay of Chateaubriand. The latter points out that English comedy, starting from ridicule, ends by approaching pathos.

4 1 X 1

(In this connection Chateaubriand barely mentions Shakspere's comedies, but refers to Sterne and Fielding). French comedy does directly the opposite. True humor, it would appear, is a distinctively English quality.[7] In the main, Baudelaire agreed with this. For him, however, the problem was a far more complicated one—a problem into which we cannot go here. In Baudelaire's essay, too, we fail to find any references to Shakspere; he refers, instead, to the "rire terrible de Melmoth"[8]—Melmoth "la grand création satanique du révérend Maturin."[9]

In 1821, the year of Baudelaire's birth, Guizot, in conjunction with Barante and Amidée Pichot, published a complete translation of Shakspere, with a *Préface* by Guizot. This was, presumably, the first attempt in France, to criticize Shakspere historically, not absolutely.[10] Unfortunately, later Baudelaire did not think much of Guizot's translation; he called it "une pauvre traduction."[11]

The years 1823-24 saw the publication of two important works: an essay on *Hamlet* by one of Guizot's collaborators, Barante, whom Baudelaire seemingly ignored, and *Racine et Shakespeare,* by Henri Beyle (Stendhal), whose work, in the main, he admired.[12] Speaking of Shakspere, Stendhal also seemed to address himself to the future author of *Les Fleurs du Mal* and the apostle of *modernity* in art and literature: "Ce qu'il faut imiter de ce grand homme (*ie.,* Shakspere), c'est la manière d'étudier le monde au milieu duquel nous vivons."[13]

A poet-critic for whom Baudelaire had a chameleon-like admiration, running the gamut from the highest praise to the most intense denigration, was none other than Victor Hugo himself. "M. Victor Hugo," Baudelaire wrote in 1855, angered by the fact that he called Delacroix's women (*i.e.,* those he painted), frogs, "est un grand poëte sculptural qui a l'oeil fermé à la spiritualité."[14] Nevertheless, he did class him with Chateaubriand and Balzac,[15] and asserted that, together with Sainte-Beuve and Alfred de Vigny, Hugo had rejuvenated or, better still, resuscitated French poetry, dead since the days of Corneille.[16] In his article on *Théophile Gautier,* in 1859, he even went so far as to exclaim: "Nos voisins disent: Shakspere et Goethe!

nous pouvons leur répondre: Victor Hugo et *Théophile* Gautier!"[17] He recognized him as the poet elected to express through poetry 'the mystery of life."[18] He was nonplussed by his command of language. "Je vois que le lexique français, en sortant de sa bouche, est devenu un monde, un univers coloré, mélodieux et mouvant."[19] How did this man come among us, he exclaims. "Perhaps it is simply because Germany had had Goethe and England Shakspere and Byron that Victor Hugo was legitimately due to France."[20] Victor Hugo possessed not only greatness but universality,[21] witness his epic-poem *la Légende des siècles.*

A good deal of this was said by Baudelaire in 1861.[22] What he had to say in 1864, the year of the celebration of the tercentenary of Shakspere's birth, is another matter and will be treated later. We must return to Hugo's *Préface* to his *Cromwell* (1827). Unquestionably, we have here another[23] important source for Baudelaire's conception of the *comic,* especially as it relates to the *grotesque.* Since space will not permit, we shall have to treat of Baudelaire's analysis of the *comic* elsewhere; for the moment, we relegate the matter to a footnote.[24] Suffice it to say here that his conception of the *comic* also involves a definition of the grotesque.[25] It will be recalled that for Hugo—and this was what Baudelaire read in the *Préface*—the characteristic quality of medieval and therefore of Romantic art is the 'grotesque.'[26] The grotesque and the beautiful blended to produce Shakpere. Since (according to Hugo) the three successive stages of the literary art are the Ode, the Epic, and the drama, Shakspere the dramatist represents the poetic summit of modern times; Shakspere *is* the drama, the form proper to the third state of civilization, the literature of reality.[27]

In the same year with the *Préface* of Hugo appeared Villemain's essay on Shakspere. What Baudelaire thought of Villemain we have already been told.[28] Certainly he couldn't agree that Shakspere was affected and belonged in England. Especially so, when the dicta came from a writer who, according to Baudelaire, "ignore l'art d'écrire une phrase, comme l'art de construire un livre."[29] A production, in the same year, of much greater moment, by a person whom Baudelaire held in infinitely greater esteem, was *Cinq-Mars* by Vigny. As is well known, the *Préface*

that accompanied it, dealt with *truth in art.* Vigny was for ideal rather than actual truth, and to this extent he was for Shakspere and *his* art as over against the growing realism of Vigny's own day. What is necessary, Vigny argued, is not 'the authenticity of the facts, but the truth of the observation of human nature.'[30] Vigny's version of *Othello*—the acting of which rôle by Rouvière Baudelaire noticed favorably[31]—had a powerful influence on the French stage as well as on criticism in 1830. At least one of the points made by Alfred de Vigny in a letter he wrote regarding the production of this play, comported with Baudelaire's conception of the function of poetry: that it must be *modern.* Shakspere? Yes. But, Vigny said, poetry must continue to 'correspond to the needs of the society in which the poet lives.'[32]

1830 was, of course, the year of *Hernani,* and it is well to recall that in the years 1827-30 the French theatre was dominated by Hugo, and therefore, in a sense, by Shakspere.[33] As Haines so well points out, Hugo's whole conception of tragedy—the 'Union of grandeur with truth'—is that which he has found in Shakspere. It is this conception which he has written into the *Préface* of *Cromwell* as well as into his book, *Shakespeare,* and it is from the former of these works that Baudelaire derived some of his ideas of laughter as well as of poetry.

I have thus given you, rather sketchily it is true, the French background against which Charles Baudelaire as a young boy in school came to be concerned with matters literary, especially as they turned on the English Bard.

II.

Actually, the future translator of Poe and De Quincey learned the tongue in which Shakspere wrote from his mother, who was born in London of French parents. As a young man he studied English while at college; though, it might be added, he failed to get honorable mention in it.[34] Thus, before the age of 18 (he took his Bachelor's degree in 1839) he was conversant with many English authors[35] in the original, Shakspere among them.

His college days over, he spent the years 1839-41 in

Paris, where, as can be readily understood from the history of the period, he moved in a romantic atmosphere charged with the enigma (as Ferran puts it) of the Evil One in the various forms of Milton's Satan: René, Lara, Herani, Antony, Faust,[36] Mephistopheles, Poe, Balzac, 'Melmoth,[37] Lélia, Walpole's *Castle of Otranto,* Anne Radcliffe's *Mysteries of Udolpho, Hoffmann,*[38] and, we must add, *Hamlet.*[39] It was in this atmosphere and out of this entourage that his conception of the *comic* and of laughter was to emerge; a conception according to which it is the Devil who manipulates the strings which motivate us, while he amuses himself cruelly in bringing about our fall through a volatilization of the metal of our will.[40]

During this period also, he fell under the spell of the *Poésies de Joseph Delorme,* as many others of his generation did. "J'ai partout feuilleté le mystère profond de ce livre," he says in a poem which he sent Sainte-Beuve in 1844. It was in reading these poems of Sainte-Beuve[41] that the eager young poet came upon the *Sonnet,* Imité de Wordsworth, the first stanza of which reads:

> *Ne ris point des sonnets, O critique moqueur!*
> *Par amour autrefois en fit le grand Shakspeare;*
> *C'est sur ce luth heureux que Pétrarque soupire,*
> *Et que le Tasse aux fers soulage un peu son coeur.*[42]

He certainly must have noted especially the poem *Retour de la Poésie,*[43] in which Hamlet is mentioned and where Hamlet's fate is compared by Sainte-Beuve (or Delorme) to that of *the Poet in general.* In the *Pensées*[44] of the same volume of poems Baudelaire came upon the passage[45] in which Delorme criticises the literary critics of his day. He says that because they laud Shakspere one day they feel that they must pass severe judgments on other authors the next day, even if one of them be Racine. How well this seemed to fit the case of Stendhal, who in his book *Shakespeare et Racine* damned the latter[46] in order to praise the former.

After a year of travel (1841-42) the young poet, who was already busy with some of the *Fleurs du Mal* poems, settled in his Parisian lodgings at the Hôtel de Pimodan. There the walls were covered with a whole series of Delacroix lithographs dealing with *Hamlet;* a central place was

given to a head symbolizing *la Douleur*[47] Almost contemporaneous with his discovery of the work of Poe (1846-7), was his acquaintance with Eugène Delacroix, under the spell of whose Shaksperianism he soon fell. There were others at the time who were infected with that spirit. Thus Mantz, in the *Artiste* for Feb., 1847, called Delacroix "Le premier parmi les maîtres violents et dramatiques, . . . le peintre de toutes les souffrances, de toutes les inquiétudes, un vrai fils de Shakespeare."[48]

If Poe and De Maistre had taught Baudelaire (as he himself averred) to 'raisonner', Delacroix had helped him to approach the very source of the modern spirit in which reason battles with itself in a tumult of emotion and passion: *Hamlet* (and its author).*

Into this source, and out of it, the intellectual and creative currents that caught Baudelaire's spirit, seemed to have their influx and efflux. In it was the spirit of tragedy, and the *grotesque* which helped to feed it. Out of it (with the aid of Poe and Hoffman) came the multiverse comprehension of tragedy through an *aesthetic of correspondences;*[49] the vision of the *universal analogy*[50] in the light of which the natural world appears as the reproduction of the spiritual world,—an appearance which it is the business of poetic genius to interpret; and (through Emerson) the idea that "The hero is he who is immovably central"[51]—an idea implicit in Shakspere's tragic heroes.[52] Out of it, too, came that very 'goût du malheur', which, according to Ferran, gives to Baudelaire's aesthetic its mark of originality.[53]

Baudelaire's early reputation as a writer was first gained by writing of Delacroix's paintings in the *Salons* of 1845 and '46. Drawing his subjects for painting from Dante and Shakspere,[54] Delacroix himself seemed to step out of the pages of one or the other. His treatment of anguish in Shakspere, in his painting *les Adieux de Roméo et Juliette,* for example, expressed for Baudelaire the painter's own

*Delacroix quotes in his *Mémoires* (Vol. III, p. 240-Jan. 4, 1860) from Chaeaubriand's *Mémoires d'Outre-tombe:* "Shakespeare est au nombre des cinq ou six *écrivains* qut ont suffi au besoin et l'aliment de la pensé. Ces génies mères semblent avoir enfanté et allaitè tous les autres."

anguish. Delacroix's strange and persistent melancholy made him the characteristic painter of the 19th century. It was this, Baudelaire thought, that explained his affinity for Dante and Shakspere, "deux autres grands peintres de la douleur humaine," two masters he knew well enough to translate into his own medium. One must not imagine for one moment that either the poetic critic, Baudelaire, or the painter-poet, Delacroix, was guilty of the aesthetic scrambling of the arts. The true painter takes from the poets that which is visually colorful. Thus, the true painter's 'préfèrent Shakespeare à Arioste'. This would also explain Delacroix's penchant for Shakspere. The following table represents the number of subjects Delacroix drew from him for painting:

1 each from *King Lear* and *The Merchant of Venice*
2 from *Macbeth*
3 from *Othello*
7 from *Hamlet*
16 from *Romeo and Juliet*

30 in all[55]

Baudelaire's description (in his *Salon de 1846*) of Delacroix's *Les Adieux de Roméo et de Juliette* deserves at least part quotation:

"Roméo et Juliette,—sur le balcon,—dans les froides clartés du matin, se tiennent religieusement embrassés par le milieu du corps. Dans cette étreinte violente de l'adieux, Juliette, les mains posées sur les épaules de son amant, rejette la tête en arrière, comme pour respirer, ou par un mouvement d'orgueil et de passion joyeuse . . .;—ce mouvement vigoureux de la nuque est particulier aux chiens et aux chats heureux d'être caressés.—Les vapeurs violacées du crépuscule enveloppent cette scène et le paysage romantique qui la complète."[56]

One great merit he found in Delacroix was that he was essentially literary. Today art-critics would hardly consider this a virtue in a painter. Baudelaire, however, belonged to the school of literary art criticism, and in its estimate Delacroix gained in stature through his ability to translate the Bible, Ariosto, Byron, Goethe, Dante, Walter Scott, and Shakspere into his own language, that of the

painter. For Baudelaire he was "le type du peintre-poëte."[57] He even goes so far as to say: ". . . nul, après Shakspeare, n'excelle comme Delacroix à fondre dans une unité mystérieuse le drame et la rêverie."[58]

Baudelaire's thinking in matters of aesthetics very often coincides with Delacroix's, especially in related problems. Two such problems are those of the *grotesque* (or the 'comique absolu') and *dis-proportion* as conditions of artistic beauty. As for the former, we have seen[59] that Baudelaire placed it at the very heart of the creative process[60] and therefore of beauty, and that in doing so, he was indebted to Victor Hugo who said that the grotesque and the beautiful blended to produce Shakspere.[61] Now as for *disproportion,*—can it be productive of beauty? Or, to use Delacroix's words: "La disproportion serait-elle une condition pour l'admiration?" His answer, couched in question form, is: "Si, d'une part, Mozart, Cimarosa, Racine étonnent moins, à cause de l'admirable proportion de leurs ouvrages, Shakespeare, Michel-Ange, Beethoven ne devront-ils pas une partie de leur effet à une cause opposée? Je le crois pour mon compte."[62] If Baudelaire thought highly of Delacroix, the latter thought no less of the former, as several entries in the painter's *Mémoires* clearly indicate. He tells of some visits from the poet and adds: "Ses vues me paraissent des plus modernes et tout à fait dans le progrès."[63] Side by side with this entry we have another one which concerns the question of Shakspere in France: "Mercredi, 4 avril 1849 . . . . Beaucoup causé musique avec Armand Bertin. *Parlé de Racine et de Shakspeare.* Il croit qu'on aura beau faire dans ce pays, on en reviendra toujours à ce qui a été le beau une fois pour notre nation; je crois qu'il a raison. Nous ne serons jamais shakespeariens. Les Anglais sont tout Shakespeare. Il les a presque faits tous ce qu'ils sont, en tout."[64] This almost sounds like Villemain's pronouncement that Shakspere belonged in England and not in France; but the tone is neither as cantankerous nor certainly as chauvinistic. Baudelaire, who could not stand the juxtaposition of the names of Hugo and Delacroix, as leaders in the Romantic movement, would have reviled the coupling of the two names in their respective reactions to Shakspere.

These, then, were the thoughts on Shakspere that Baudelaire expressed in the course of his criticism of Delacroix's works, or that came to him from his contemplation of them. We turn now to the reflection of the Bard's work in Baudelaire's own creative output.

III.

Practically his first published work, *La Fanfarlo*,[65] is a novelette in which the story of Samuel Cramer is really that of Charles Baudelaire. A self-directed irony runs through this story. The poet in this work, Baudelaire tells us, has made a "recueil de sonnets, comme nous en avons tous fait et tous lu, dans le temps où nous avions le jugement si court et les cheveux si longs."[66]

Consider the Hamlet-like quality and tone of the following monologue in *La Fanfarlo*,[67] addressed by the hero to a lady. "Madame, pity me, or rather pity us, for there are many brethren of my sort. It is hatred of all and of ourselves which led us to these lies. It is out of despair at our inability to be noble and beautiful in a natural way that we have so bizarrely made up our faces. We have devoted ourselves so assiduously to sophisticating our hearts, we have so persistently abused the microscope for the purpose of studying the hideous excresences of our hearts, whose sores we enlarge at pleasure, that it has become impossible for us to speak the language of ordinary men . . . We have altered the very accent of nature . . . We have psychologized like madmen who augment their own madness in straining to understand it. Cursèd, thrice cursèd be the infirm parents who begat us rachitic and ill-born."[68]

What have we here but the thinly disguised outcry of "Wormwood, wormwood!"[69] on the part of the future author of *Flowers of Evil*.

It was Maxwell Bodenheim who pointed out in one of his early poems that we all like to play Hamlet. That rôle is very often played by some of us unconsciously; others are provoked to the antics of the melancholy Dane by a definite set of circumstances, which, in the case of Baudelaire, make the identification clear and conscious.

The events in Baudelaire's family early predisposed him to the Hamlet rôle, and that motif was to sound 'throughout the disordered symphony of the poet's life.'[70] Like his great literary prototype, he too 'could not forget or forgive what he called his mother's infidelity to the memory of his father.'[71] He could never be reconciled to General Aupick, his stepfather. He too could say, "But I have that within which passeth show. These but the trappings and the suits of woe."[72] Ferran definitely refers to Baudelaire's "amour d'une mère: la jalousie hamlétienne," and says further: "Farouche Hamlet, le petit Charles voue à l'intrus (*i.e.,* de M.Aupick) une haine dont les biographes se font l'écho."[73]

Yes, Cramer (in *La Fanfarlo*) is Baudelaire looking in the mirror of his imagination and beholding himself as Hamlet. (Not, we add in parenthesis, the foolish Hamlet of Dumas and Paul Meurice's play, which appeared the same year as *La Fanfarlo,* and in which the hero escaped the poisoned rapier to enjoy a long life and a merry one on the throne of Denmark).[74]

While the *Flowers of Evil* were growing and being gathered into an unforgettable bouquet, Baudelaire was busy assimilating the sombre spirit of Poe's stories as well as the lucidity and brilliance of his philosophy of poetic composition. I am referring to Baudelaire's translation as an assimilation, since he himself regarded it as such. "Savez-vous pourquoi j'ai patiemment traduit Poe? *Parce qu'il me ressemblait.*"[75] He could not say this of Shakspere, for his feeling about the Bard was precisely the feeling he had for Hamlet. That feeling was articulated for him by Hugo. When reviewing *Les Misérables* (in 1862), he quoted the following from the *Préface* to *Marie Tudor,* because it apparently expressed what he himself felt: "The stumbling-block of the *true* is the small or petty; the stumbling-block of the great is the false. Admirable, all-powerful poet! He creates things higher than ourselves, which, however, exist even as we do. Hamlet, for example, is as true as any of us, but greater. Hamlet is colossal, and yet real. And that is because Hamlet is neither you nor I, but all of us. Ham- have here a clue to why he did not attempt the translation let is not *a man;* he is *Man.*"[76] Psychologically, then, we

of Shakspere, whereas he did translate Poe[77] and de Quincey.

This is not the time to dwell on Baudelaire and Poe; but we must make one point which is important here for our purpose. We wish to emphasize a link, which obviously has its roots in Shakspere and reveals the American and French poets using a common source. We know that Baudelaire read with great care and admiration Poe's *Philosophy of Composition* as well as his *The Poetic Principle.*[78] The former contains the telling phrase of the *Midsummer Night's Dream* passage on the Poet. "Most writers," Poe says, "poets in especial, prefer having it understood that they compose by a species of *fine frenzy*—an ecstatic intuition,"[79] etc. Later on (sometime between 1862 and 1864), in his *Mon Coeur Mis a Nu,* Baudelaire puts it down as a sort of self-imposed goal or program: "Trouver la *frénésie* journalière"—this, on the very page in which he asserts, "De Maistre et Edgar Poe m'ont appris à raisonner."[80]

In *Bénédiction,* a poem in the *Spleen et Idéal* series of *Fleurs du Mal,* there is more than a shadow of awareness of that passage in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* in which the triune identification of the lunatic, the lover, and the poet is made. They are all alike, madmen with 'seething brains' and 'shaping fantasies, that apprehend / More than cool reason ever comprehends.'[81] Mothers who beget such have no reason to rejoice, and certainly that would be true of the mother who gives birth to a poet. Listen to Baudelaire anent this:

> *Lorsque, par un décret des puissances suprêmes,*
> *Le Poète apparaît en ce monde ennuyé,*
> *Sa mère épouvantée et pleine de blasphèmes*
> *Crispe ses poings vers Dieu, qui la prend en pitié;*
> *"Ah! que n'ai-je mis bas tout un noeud de vipères,*
> *Plutôt que de nourir cette dérision!*
> *Maudite soit la nuit aux plaisirs éphémères*
> *Où mon ventre a conçu mon expiation!*[82]

But, once he is born—and we must forget the discomfiture of the unfortunate mother—we find that the poet, partaking of the nature of his other two mad brethren, is 'of imagination all compact.' What his case is like is stated more fully thus:

> The poet's eye, in a *fine frenzy* rolling,
> Doth glance from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven;
> And as imagination bodies forth
> The forms of things unknown, the poet's pen
> Turns them to shapes and gives to airy nothing
> A local habitation and a name.

By way of aesthetic coda, the Bard reflects:

> Such tricks hath strong imaginatiön,
> That, if it would but apprehend some joy,
> It comprehends some bringer of that joy;
> Or in the night, imagining some fear,
> How easy is a bush suppos'd a bear!

We have, then, the paradoxical circumstance of evil being the fertile ground for good; the madman as a bringer of joy—les fleurs du mal.

Turning again to Baudelaire, we find the condition of the ill-begotten poet or madman expressed as follows:

> *Pourtant, sous la tutelle invisible d'un Ange,*
> *L'Enfant déshérité s'enivre de soleil, . . .*
> *Il joue avec le vent, cause avec le nuage*
> *Et s'enivre en chantant du chemin de la croix;*
> *Et l'Esprit qui le suit dans son pèlerinage*
> *Pleure de le voir gai comme un oiseau des bois . .*
> *Tous ceux qu'il veut aimer l'observent avec crainte, : . .*
> *Et s'accusent d'avoir mis leurs pieds dans ses pas.*[83]

Add to the above this stanza from *l'Albatros,* which echoes De Vigny, whom Baudelaire greatly admired, and who was himself a great admirer of Shakspere:

> *Le Poète est semblable au prince des nuées*
> *Qui hante la tepête et se rit de l'archer;*
> *Exilé sur le sol au milieu des huées,*
> *Ses ailes de géant l'empêchent de marcher.*[84]

We have here at least a suggestion of the *wild-genius-frenzy* conception of the poet.

Undoubtedly, for Baudelaire the chief significance of the *Midsummer Night's Dream* intermezzo on the nature of the Poet was to be found in the central position occupied by the imagination in the creative process. He found in this centrality a corrective of what he considered an aesthetic error in the whole romantic movement: the use of the term, *Poetry of the heart* (*La poésie du coeur!*), and the attribu-

tion to it of a kind of infallibility. "On donnait ainsi," he says, "plein droit à la passion . . . . Combien de contre-sens et de sophismes peut imposer à la langue française une erreur d'esthétique! Le coeur contient la passion, le coeur erreur d'esthétique! Le coeur contient la pasion, le coeur contient le dévouement, le crime; l'Imagination seule contient la poésie."[85] Incidentally, those who have read the fascinating *Mémoires* of Delacroix will recall his recurrent prose-songs to Imagination.[86] The two men, the painter and the poet, had so many thoughts in common, especially as they touched on the universal source of artistic creation. For both, the antinomy between art and science is resolved in Baudelaire's idea that "The imagination is the queen of truth" and so of the human faculties, because it "draws upon the inexhaustible source of analogy."[87]

So much, then, for the rapprochement between *Les Fleurs du Mal* and Shakspere on the subject of *Imagination.* The next link between the two is one that we might readily expect to find in the work of a poet who had read the translated De Quincey and was therefore made further aware of *Macbeth* by reading De Quincey's well-known essay *On the Knocking at the Gate in Macbeth.*[88] Indeed, according to G. T. Clapton, Baudelaire's *'beauté du mal'* and *"le goût de l'infini"*—two basic ideas in his poetry—owe a good deal to the author of *Murder as a Fine Art* (1827).[89] The more inclusive truth is, of course, that both owed such ideas to the author of *Hamlet* and *Macbeth.* And for 'douleur', Baudelaire was certainly indebted to the writer, who knew the grief of losing an only son, and who put into the mouth of Constance, who is 'as fond of grief as of (her) child', these words:

> Grief fills the room up of my absent child,
> Lies in his bed, walks up and down with me,
> Puts on his pretty looks, repeats his words,
> Remembers me of all his gracious parts,
> Stuffs out his vacant garments with his form;
> Then, have I reason to be fond of grief?"[90]

Simultaneously with his reading of De Quincey, Baudelaire was writing on *Delacroix* and his paintings drawn from *Macbeth.*[91] He was also more than looking into Stendhal's *Histoire de la peinture en Italie,* where, while talking

of "les scènes touchantes produites par les passions,"[92] Stendhal refers to Shakspere and to Macbeth.[93] Concerned with the 'vaporisation . . . . du Moi,[94], he started, after the fashion of Poe's *Marginalia, Mon Coeur Mis a Nu.*[95] But, it is in the poem *L'Idéal,* that we get the most pointed expression of that heart which was being consumed in so many different artistic ways. In that poem he says:

> *Ce qu'il faut à ce coeur profond comme un abime,*
> *C'est vous, Lady Macbeth, âme puissante au crime . . .*[96]

The parallelism between the next two passages—the one from *Les Fleurs du Mal* and the other from the *Sonnets* of Shakspere—may have escaped the attention of scholars because of contrast in the midst of similarity. I quote first from the last two stanzas of *Les Sept Vieillards,* a poem dedicated to Victor Hugo:

> *Exaspéré comme un ivrogne qui voit double,*
> *Je rentrai, je fermai ma porte, épouvanté,*
> *Malade et morfondu, l'esprit fiévreux et troublé,*
> *Blessé par le mystère et par l'absurdité!*
>
> *Vainement ma raison voulait prendre la barre;*
> *La tempête en jouant déroutait ses efforts,*
> *Et mon âme dansait, dansait, vieille gabare*
> *Sans mâts, sur une mer monstrueuse et sans bords!*[97]

Now take Sonnet XXIX:

> When, in disgrace with fortune and men's eyes,
> I all alone beweep my outcast state,
> And trouble deaf heaven with my bootless cries,
> And look upon myself and curse my fate,
> Wishing me like to one more rich in hope,
> . . . . . .
> Desiring this man's art and that man's scope,
> With what I most enjoy contented least;
> Yet in these thoughts myself almost despising,
> Haply I think on thee, and then my state,
> Like to the lark at break of day arising,
> From sullen earth, sings hymns at heaven's gate . . . . etc.

To say the least, it is quite obvious that we have here a recurrent poetic theme,[98] where the central mood is recognizable as common to both poems. But, of course, we have in Shakspere's sonnet the contrasting element of love dispelling the mood of depression and breaking into a hymn of joy. By the time the theme gets to Baudelaire, Shakspere's neo-Platonism is consumed in the cauldron of 19th-century pes-

simism and introspection. We have the Baudelairian influence predominating over the Shaksperian idea, as it were. Our theme becomes, then, more rightly defined by the caption *Baudelaire and Shakspere* rather than the title in reverse.

[To be concluded]

---

[1]Haines, C. M., *Shakespeare in France, Criticism, Voltaire to Victor Hugo.* London, 1925.

[2]Raysor, Thomas Middleton, ed., *Coleridge's Shakespearean Criticism. Cambridge,* 1930, Vol. II, 169. (As reported by J. P. Collier.)

[3]Emerson left Voltaire out of his *Representative Men.*

[4]Baudelaire, Charles *Oeuvres.* Texte Établi et annoté par Y. G. Le Dentec. Paris, N. d. p. 651.

[5]*Ibid,* II, 610. [6]*Ibid,* 587. [7]Haines, 91. [8]Baudelaire, *Oeuvres,* II, 174. [9]*Ibid,* 171. [10]Haines, 109. [11]Baudelaire, *Oeuvres,* II, 763.

[12]Baudelaire was fond of quoting Stendhal's definition of Beauty. *"Le Beau n'est que la promesse du bonheur."* (*Ibid,* 327).

[13]Quoted in Rhodes, S.A., *The Cult of Beauty in Baudelaire.* N. Y., 1929, I, 128.

[14]Baudelaire, *Oeuvres,* II, 161. [15]*Ibid,* 461.

[16]*Ibid,* 463.

[17]*Ibid,* 478.

[18]*Ibid,* 520.

[19]*Ibid,* 521.

[20]*Ibid,* 522.

[21]*Ibid.*

[22]*Ibid,* 517-529 (In Réflexions sur Quelques-uns de mes Contemporains. *Victor Hugo.*)

[23]The first source is that of Chateubriand. *Vide ante 1.*

[24]For Baudelaire the comic is, from an artistic point of view, an imitation; the grotesque, a creation. We quote from his *De l'Essence du Rire:* "Le comique est une imitation mêlee d'une certain faculté créatrice, c'est-à-dire d'une idéalité artistique. Or, l'orgueil humain . . . qui est la cause naturelle du rire dans le cas du comique, devient aussi cause naturelle du rire dans le cas du grotesque, qui est une création mêlée d'une certaine faculté imitatrice, d'éléments prê-existants dans la nature . . . Dans ce cas-lâ le rire est l'expression de l'idée de supériorité, non plus de l'homme sur l'homme, mais de l'homme sur la nature. . . . Le rire causé par le grotesque a en soi quelque chose de profond, d'axiomatique et de primitif qui se rapproche beaucoup plus de la vie innocente et de la joie absolue que le rire causé par le comique de moeurs . . ." This grotesque Baudelaire chooses to call the 'comique absolu' by contrast (he says) to the 'comique ordinaire', which he calls the 'comique significatif.' (*Oeuvres,* II, 175).

[25]Incidentally, Bergson is considerably indebted to Baudelaire for his analysis of laughter.

[26]Nowhere in his *Préface* does Hugo define the grotesque directly. One gathers his meaning from a series of inter-locking ideas, which may be enumerated as follows:

1. Christianity led poetry (the Muse) to see that not everything in creation is humanly beautiful; that the ugly exists side by side with the beautiful, the grotesque with the sublime.

2. The grotesque—an element foreign to antiquity—is a new type introduced into Poetry. Its form is that of comedy.

3. Actually, then, the grotesque is the ugly incorporated in an art form.

4. The fertile union of the grotesque with the sublime gives birth (according to Hugo) to modern genius which in its complexity is opposed to the uniform simplicity of the genius of antiquity. (This is the difference between *classic* and *romantic* literature).

5. The grotesque did exist among the ancients, but occupied a recessive place. In

modern thought and art, on the contrary, its rôle is immense. It is everywhere. It makes Sganarelle dance about Don Juan and Mephistopheles around Faust.

6. As an element of contrast, the grotesque is, according to Hugo, the richest source that nature can open to art. It is a term of comparison as well as of departure from which one may rise to the beautiful with a fresher and keener perception.

7. In the drama, which represents (for Hugo) the summit of poetic development and of which Shakspere is in turn the summit, the sublime and the grotesque interlink as they do in life and in creation.

8. The two rival geniuses—the grotesque and the sublime—unite their double flame and from this flame emerges Shakspere. [*Vide Préface de Cromwell, passim*].

[27]Haines, 131; Hugo's *Préface de Cromwell, passim.*

[28]*Vide ante,* 1.

[29]Baudelaire, *Oeuvres,* II, 585 (L'Esprit de M. Villemain).

[30]Haines, quoted in 139.

[31]In a necrologic article, in *La Petite Revue,* Oct. 28, 1865. (*Vide* Baudelaire, *Oeuvres* II note, 782, and 612-613).

[32]Haines, 143.

[33]Haines, 145.

[34]Ferran, *André. L'Esthétique de Baudelaire.* Paris, 1933, pp. 7, 159.

[35]Shelley, Byron, Keats, Coleridge, Wordsworth, Scott, Maturin, Lewis, Anne Radcliffe, Walpole, Milton, Gray, Young, Tennyson, Longfellow, Emerson, Poe, Sterne, Cowper, and, of course, Shakspere.

[36]Translated by Gérard de Nerval in 1828. (Ferran, 87).

[37]Balzac called Maturin one of the greatest geniuses of Europe. (Ferran, 87).

[38]First translated into French by Loêve-Veimars, 1830-33. Gautier wrote on Hoffmann. (Ferran, 88).

[39]Ferran, 86, 87.

[40]Ferran, 89.

[41]*Vie, Poésies, et Pensées de Joseph Delorme.* Bruxelles, 1837, ed'n 2.

[42]*Ibid,* 243.

[43]*Ibid,* 89.

[44]In the *Pensées,* IV, Delorme menoisn a French translation of *Romeo and Juliet* (p. 269). He uses a few lines spoken by Mercutio to illustrate his discussion of the Alexandrine form.

[45]*Pensées,* XIV, p. 288.

[46]Actually Baudelaire believed in, and admired, the "Puissance de l'analyse racinienne." (See *Oeuvres,* II, 435).

[47]Ferran, pp. 88, 152, 194.

[48]Ferran, 256.

[49]Baudelaire, II, 71; 521; 471.

[50]*Ibid,* 521 and 471. In the main, Ferran denies Poe's poetic influence on B., though he admits that P. and B., in common with many other poets and philosophers, shared the notion of the *Universal Analogy, i.e.,* that the natural world is the reproduction of the spiritual world and that poetic genius interprets this analogy. (Ferran, 175 and194).

[51]Ferran, 199. According to Ferran, he also knew Emerson's *Representative Men* and *The Conduct of Life.*

[52]Except, of course, that their centrality is disturbed by a *tragic fault.*

[53]Ferran, 212.

[54]As early as 1846 (Salon of 1846) Baudelaire considered that Delacroix's taste for both Dante and Shakspere constituted a perfect balance. He linked Delacroix's Pieta of that year with his *Hamlet* (See Baudelaire, *Oeuvres,* II, 80, 82). His *Hamlet,* Baudelaire said, was so much railed at and so little understood (*Oeuvres,* II, 84, 85).

[55]This table is drawn from the *Appendix* of the 3-volume *Mémoires* of Eugène Delacroix, a veritable mine of important and fascinating information of the period. Incidentally, Mr. Pach's translation is amusing and useful only to the casual reader. The student cannot afford to substitute the translation for the original.

[56]Baudelaire, *Oeuvres,* II, 84.

[57]*Ibid,* 237 (also 163).

[58]*Ibid,* 160.

[59]*Vide ante.*

[60]Baudelaire, *Oeuvres,* II, 183 ('De L'Essence du Rire', *passim*).

[61]*Vide ante.*
[62]Delacroix, Eugène, *Journal de Paris,* 1893, II, 187, 188.
[63]*Ibid,* I, 342 (Feb. 5, 1849).
[64]*Ibid,* I, 361.
[65]Published 1847.
[66]Baudelaire, *Oeuvres,* I, 533.
[67]*Ibid,* 534.
[68]We have translated freely.
[69]*Hamlet,* III, ii, 191.
[70]*The Poems and Prose Poems of Charles Baudelaire,* with an Introductory Preface by James Huneker. Brentano N. Y. nd), xxvii.
[71]*Ibid,* XLII.
[72]*Hamlet,* I, ii, 85-6.
[73]Ferran, 671, 7.
[74]Haines, p. 147. This version of the play ends with the reappearance of the ghost, in the rôle of a deus ex machina, to announce the good news of Hamlet's escape from death. And to think that it was Dumas who said that, after God, Shakspere had created most. (161).
[75]Baudelaire, *Lettres,* 1841-1866, p.362.
[76]Our free translation from Baudelaire, *Oeuvres,* II, 580.
[77]Baudelaire first got to know the work of Poe in 1846. In 1847 Isabelle Meunier had published in *la Démocratie Pacifique* a translation of Poe. In 1848, one year after the appearance of his *La Fanfarlo,* Baudelaire first translated Poe for *La Liberté de Pensée* (15 July). In 1852, when the *Revue de Paris* printed his *Edgar Poe, Sa Vie et Ses Ouvrages,* Taine praised Baudelaire's translation. According to Symons, his translations came (more or less) in this order: *Histoires Extraordinaires,* 1856; *Nouvelles Hist. Ext.,* 1857; *Adventures d'A. Gordon Pym,* 1858; *Eureka,* 1864; *Histoires Grotesques et Sérieuses,* 1865. (See Symons, Arthur, *Charles Baudelaire, A Study,* London, 1920, p. 41). There are no references to Shakspere in Baudelaire's *Edgar Allen Poe, Sa Vie et Ses Ouvrages.* The references to Shakspere in Poe's own work are as follows:

I. Letter to Mr. ——— (241, 242, 247), 1831. There is a caustic reference here to fools who have a high opinion of Shakspere though they have never read him; their opinion is only a derivative from 'a few gifted individuals, who kneel around the summit, beholding, face to face, the master spirit who stands upon the pinnacle' (242). Then Poe scores the scholar who, when asked for a definition of Poetry, runs to Dr. Johnson for a definition. 'Shade of the immortal Shakspeare! I imgained to myself the scowl of your spiritual eye upon the profanity of that scurrilous Ursa Major. Think of poetry, dear B———, think of poetry, and then think of ——— Dr. Samuel Johnson! Think of all that is airy and fairy-like, and then of all that is hideous and unwieldy; think of his huge bulk, the Elephant! and then ——— then think of the Tempest—the Midsummer Night's Dream—Prospero—Oberon—and Titania!' (247-8). Then Poe goes on to state what, in his opinion, a poem is. He finds music *essential* to it—"the idea without the music is prose," etc. He adds the question, "What was meant by the invective against 'him who had no music in his soul'—from *The Merchant of Venice,* V, i, 81-8 (248).

II. *Tortesa, The Usurer: A Play* by N. P. Willis, Samuel Colman, New York. (A review by Poe, pub. in Burton's *Gentleman's Magazine,* Aug., 1839). "The old manoeuvre of the sleeping draught calls *'Romeo and Juliet'* somewhat too forcibly to mind. The idea, too, of the deception practised upon Tortesa by means of the portrait is borrowed apparently from the *'Winter's Tale'*, and is, moreover, absurd. No person could have been thus deceived . . ." (284).

III. *Al Aaraaf,* Pt. II, L. 60: "Young flowers were whispering in melody." Poe's own note to this line of his poem was: "Fairies use flowers for their charactery.—*Merry Wives of Windsor,* V, v, 70." (487).

IV. *The Sleeper,* line 26. 'Above the closed and fringéd lid." Prof. Killis Campbell compares for 'fringéd lid' *The Tempest,* I, ii, 407: "The fringed curtains of thine eye advance." (494).

V. *The Bells,* line 50: "By the side of the pale-faced moon." For the 'pale-faced moon' we are referred to *Henry IV,* I, iii, 202 (507).

VI. *For Annie,* lines 63-4: "A rosemary odor,
Commingled with pansies ——"
Prof. K. Campbell sees in this a reference to Ophelia's words, *Hamlet,* IV, v, 156 ff

(508).

(For all of the above page references, in parentheses, I am indebted to *Edgar Allan Poe, Representative Selections,* with Introduction, Bibliography, and Notes, begun by Margaret Alterton and completed by Hardin Craig. American Book Co. N. Y. 1935).

[78]We are not entering here into the controversy, indulged in by Rhodes, Patterson, Seylaz, Cambière, Valéry, on the extent to which Poe modified Baudelaire's ideas. (Valéry calls Poe "le principal agent de la modification des idées et de l'art de Baudelaire"; Patterson and Seylaz would agree with Valéry in this; but Quennell and Rhodes do not. (*Vide* Quennell, Peter, Baudelaire and the Symbolists. London. 1929. p. XI, and Rhodes, II, 339, et passim). We are rather interested in discerning a *common current of ideas,* which is particularly interesting and important for the history of aesthetic and poetic thought.

[79]Poe, 336 (The Phil. of Comp.).

[80]Baudelaire, *Oeuvres,* II, 669. (Mon Coeur Mis A Nu).

[81]*A Midsummer Night's Dream,* V, i, 4f.

[82]Baudelaire, *Les Fleurs du Mal, Bénédiction* (in Spleen et Idéal series).

[83]*Ibid.*

[84]*Ibid, L'Albatros* (in Spleen et Idéel series).

[85]Baudelaire, *Oeuvres,* II, 468.

[86]According to M. Ferran (265), the whole hymn to Imagination sung by Baudelaire is but a corollary of thoughts, expressed by Delacroix in his *Journal:* "Elle est la première qualité de l'artiste . . ." Then Delacroix talks of "Ces sources obscures de nos plus sublimes émotions, et dont nous recevons ces chocs mystérieux que notre âme, dégagee en quelque sorte des liens terrestres et retirée dans ce qu'elle a de plus immatériel, reçoit sans presque en avoir la conscience." Delacroix, Journal III, 44, 25, Jan., 1857. In essence, what Delacroix—a great admirer of Shakspere—has to say, is compactly expressed in the *MSND* passage on the Poet.

[87]Baudelaire, *Oeuvres,* II, 225, 227, 521.

[88]T. De Quincey, *'On The Knocking at the Gate.' Miscellaneous Essays,* 1854; from *The London Magazine,* Oct., 1823. Reprinted in *The Art of Conversation,* 1863. Baudelaire probably read this essay sometime during 1839-44, the period during which, Prof. Clapton conjectures, he read the first edition (1822) of *The Confessions of an Opium Eater* (See G. T. Clapton, *Baudelaire et DeQuincey,* Oct., 1931; p. 12).

[89]"Les périodes éloquentes de De Quincey sur la douleur ont du faire sur le jeune Baudelaire une impression profonde." "Si Baudelaire a lu De Quincey . . . avant 1845, il a du dès ce moment absorber certaines idées que l'on attribue en général â Poe ou à de Maistre." G. T. C., p. 121.

[90]*King John,* III, iv, 93f.

[91]Baudelaire, *Oeuvres,* II, (Salon de 1846), 100-101.

[92]*Ibid.* (Also note 24, p. 746).

[93]He also quoted from Stendhal the idea emphasized by DeVigny, that all of society is arraigned against 'l'homme supérieur', the poet. Thinking of that society as so many voracious beasts Baudelaire once wrote: "Ne cherchez plus mon coeur: les bêtes l'ont mangé'. See Baudelaire, *Oeuvres,* II, 321).

[94]Baudelaire, *Oeuvres,* II, 642 (Mon Coeur Mis A Nu).

[95]Baudelaire, *Oeuvres,* II, 786 (Note 2). Suggested title of Poe: 'Heart laid Bare'.

[96]Fleurs du Mal, *Spleen et Idéal* Series.

[97]*Ibid, Tableaux* Parisiens series.

[98]Max I. Baym, "Recurrent Poetic Theme," *SAB,* Vol. xii, No. 3, July, 1937, 155-158.

WILLIAM SHAKSPERE, BOTANIST

By PHYLLIS COOK

I. INTRODUCTION

THE plants that Shakspere named in his plays and his method of using them have long been favorite subjects for amateur botanists to investigate. The field is a rich one, surprising in its variety and significance. It is often tempting to read into Shakspere's words more than is really there, but it is just as easy to miss some of his less obvious allusions. As a botanist interested in the plays, I have tried to find out from them how much Shakspere knew about plants and their habits and to some extent how he made use of this knowledge in his work. Many difficulties have presented themselves. Chief among them is the matter of nomenclature; for then as now, certain plants were known by one set of names in one locality, and by another set somewhere else, as today the cuckoo-pint of Sussex is the Jack-in-the-pulpit of Pennsylvania; or the same name might have been applied to one plant in one place and to an entirely different plant in another. "Cowslip" to an Englishman means a low-growing, furry-stemmed, yellow flower, while to a Pennsylvanian, the same name means the taller, smooth-stemmed, blue Virginia cowslip with its tinge of pink. In studying Shakspere's plants, I have tried to identify them with present English flora, and secondly, with that described by other Shaksperian students; and at the end of my paper I shall list Shakspere's name for the plant with what seems to be its modern scientific name, along with a number of the lines of its occurrence in the plays. I shall also try to point out the rôle that plants play in Shakspere's work.

II. THE VARIETY OF PLANTS

The plays mention a great variety of plants, ranging all the way from the green scum on the pond to the majestic English oaks. I am sure that Shakspere did not know the green scum that forms on standing water as "algae," because it is doubtful whether the word was yet introduced for that use; it is a word of Greek origin first used to describe seaweeds, the largest of an enormous group of lowly,

little-known plants. Shakspere may not even have realized that the green scum was living, but he had observed it, for he mentions it in at least three different connections. In *The Tempest,* Ariel leads the three drunken servants into "the filthy-mantled pool" and leaves them wallowing there; in *King Lear* Edgar characterizes himself as the homeless fool "who drinks the green scum of the standing pond"; and in the *Merchant of Venice* Gratiano speaks of a kind of men "whose visages do cream and mantle like a standing pond." It is amazing to me how remarkably suggestive of the slimy, foul-smelling scum the words, cream, filthy, and mantle are.

The use of the fungi indicates that Shakspere considered them imbued with a mysterious sort of life. Edgar, in *King Lear,* thinks he sees the fiend that mildews the white wheat, and Prospero calls on the beings that draw fairy rings,—"green sour ringlets" with their "midnight mushrooms"—which are so common on the damp English hills where the sheep pasture. Whenever anything about mushrooms is said, their existence is attributed to magic, which was the usual way of accounting for their sudden, overnight appearance.

Moss is a fairly common word in the plays, but it is never described very fully, and it is likely that most of the allusions really refer to lichens. There is one use of moss in *Cymbeline,* which I think refers to true moss. One of the princes swears to cover Imogen's grave with "furr'd moss" when summer flowers are gone. But most other references are to lichens. The living oaks "whose boughs were mossed with age" provide a favorable place for foliose lichens to grow, and in England's damp, warm climate, these plants grow comparatively large and green and become more or less moss-like. As far as I can find, Shakspere made only one allusion to ferns, and that an inaccurate one in which seeds are attributed to ferns. Gadshill, in *I Henry IV,* says he, has fern-seed in his possession and therefore walks invisible. His so-called "seed" were really spores from which form in brown masses on the backs of common fern-fonds. They differ from seeds in that they contain no embryo plant like the parent. They are extremely minute, and Gadshill's

assertion concurs with an old idea. Once it was thought that plants had magic properties, and that the magic effect had some connection with the nature of the plant; for instance, the liver-shaped leaves of the Hepatica were considered good for liver ailments; similarly fern-spores so minute that they could not be seen except in great numbers would naturally tend to make one invisible.

References to true seed-bearing plants are very frequent and varied. I am rather surprised that there are only four evergreens,—the "upright" cedar, the "proud-topped" pine, the "sad" cypress, and the "dismal" yew. The cedar was, in all likelihood, the cedar of Lebanon, so greatly revered abroad and brought to England by travelers. It is not easy to say what pines are meant. They are characterized as "mountain" pines wagging their tops in the wind. Possibly it was the so-called Scotch pine that Shakspere knew best. The cypress and the yew were almost surely the common trees still closely associated with graveyards. Broad-leaved trees are such an intimate part of the English countryside that it is quite fitting that they often form part of the natural background for scenes in the plays. Many of them are specifically named. The oaks, as one would expect, are most frequently alluded to. Very often large old oaks made convenient trysting-places. Other trees were evidently not just "trees" to Shakspere, for he has qualified them with good specific names and differences—for instance, "the "barky fingers of the elm," "the cool shade of the sycamore," "the willow aslant a brook," "a tuft of olives," "sharp hawthorn," holly, box, "the threatening twigs of birch," bay, "grained ash," line or linden, "shaking like an aspen leaf," and Julius Caesar's palm.

Many fruit trees have found a congenial home in England for a long time, and the people in Shakspere's plays speak familiarly of apples "rotten at the heart," dangling "apricocks," cherries, figs, peaches, "French" pears, plums, mulberries, quinces, medlars, "rotten ripe," and "clustering bunches" of grapes. They knew too the fruit of the orange and the lemon. Orange and lemon trees had been introduced into England by 1595, and so it is possible that Shakspere and his audience knew not only the fruit but also the trees. Juliet's nurse asked for dates for the pastry, and the night-

ingale sang in the pomegranate tree in the Capulet's orchard, but it is improbable that the English knew these trees except by hearsay. Filberts and almonds are mentioned and so are the shells of walnuts; and so it seems to me that but few of the present common English fruits and nuts are omitted.

Shakspere uses the word "vine" often, but it usually refers only to the cultivated grape. A few other vines, "usurping" ivy, brambles, "luscious" woodbine, and honeysuckle, which may mean the same plant, twine about stronger plants and very often are used symbolically. "He was the ivy that hid my princely trunk," says Prospero of his brother. Non-vining shrubs are common in the plays. Groves of broom, sweet-smelling leaves of eglantine or sweet-briar, "stinking" elder, rosemary, and rue are all common experiences of the English, and as such they are included naturally. Among other dry things that shipwrecked Gonzalo longs for is the brown furze which clothes the slopes of the English Downs. Mistletoe grows as a partial parasite on oak and apple trees in England, and Shakspere characterizes it as "baleful." The clown of *The Winter's Tale,* preparing for the sheep-shearing feast, finds he must have spices—mace and nutmeg, among others. Mace and nutmeg are produced by the same plant, a small tree native to Asia and Madagascar. The nutmeg is the kernel of the fruit, mace the dried and ground fleshy covering. These spices had been for a long time important items of trade.

Low, non-woody plants, as one would expect, are present in the plays in the greatest profusion and variety. They are the plants which are most intimately concerned with every phase of daily life and the ones that we cannot help but see. Shakspere was no systematic botanist in his use of them, and so they fall most easily into five rough and by-no-means botanical groups—(1) the grasses, sedges, and grains, (2) the vegetables and spices, (3) the poisonous and medicinal herbs, (4) the melancholy and repulsive herbs, and (5) the pleasant herbs. Grass is frequently used as a general term for any low-jointed-stemmed, narrow-leaved plant, and no matter where the scene of the play is laid, we know that it is green, well-nourished English grass that is in the poet's mind. Even on Prospero's isolated island, Gonzalo cries,

"How lush and lusty the grass looks!" Rushes and sedges usually connote weakness; and Rosalind likens love to "a cage of rushes." The grains of wheat, oats, barley, rye, and rice were important food crops then as now, but contrary to present conditions, good times were associated with their abundance. Peas and vetches were grown for food for man and beast. All the foregoing, with the exception of rice, were produced in great plenty for the betrothal of Miranda and Ferdinand.

Many of our present vegetables, or at least types from which ours have been developed, must have been well-known in Shakspere's time, for his people speak familiarly about peas, beans, cabbage, squash, garlic, onions, leeks, and radishes. Falstaff's host reckons that he has known Falstaff "twenty-nine years come peascod-time," just as to-day in rural England birthdays are remembered by pea-picking or 'tater-digging time. It is interesting, too, that Falstaff exclaims, "Let the sky rain potatoes!" so soon after their introduction into England. Caliban proposes to dig pignut tubers for his wondrous new master, Trinculo. Besides mace and nutmeg, the clown of *The Winter's Tale* wants "saffron to colour the warden pies, a race or two of ginger." Ginger is the dried root-stock of a perennial, creeping herb of the East Indies, and saffron is a bright yellow spice made from the dried stigmas of the common yellow crocus.

Shakspere knew something of the poisonous and medicinal properties of many plants, for in that sense he used aconite, senna, rhubarb, and hemlock; and his Iago, that prince of devils, measured the effect of his evil upon Othello as being stronger than the powers of poppy and mandragora. My next group—the melancholy and repulsive herbs—might be confused with the preceding except that it seems to me that those have a definite effect upon the physical system, while the latter exercise a subtler effect upon the emotions. Among these are the flowers that Ophelia gathered—nettles, daisies, crow-flowers, and long purples or dead men's fingers which are, in more specific (though less expressive) words, a kind of wild orchid; and the weeds with which the mad Lear crowned himself—fumitory, burdock, hemlock—not the evergreen tree but the Socrates hemlock,

an ally of the parsnip, nettle, and cuckoo-flowers; and other dismal plants like knot-grass, heather, docks, mallows, wormwood, and all the weeds that grow "in our sustaining corn." The pleasant herbs are pleasant to think of and pleasant to name—plants that breathe all the sweetness of English woods and fields and gardens in spring—primrose, cowslip, harebell and violet; daffodil and narcissus; plants that breathe the warmth of summer,—pansy, thyme, mint, marjoram, crown imperial, lily, flower-de-luce, clover, lady-smock, strawberry, columbine, and rose; plants like carnations and gilly-flowers which represent man's skill with plant breeding, a practice with which Perdita, at least, is not in sympathy.

Such a variety of the plants, ranging from algae and fungi, over mosses and ferns, grasses and sedges, to fruit-trees, oaks, and carnations, comprises a fair sampling of English flora, including native and also naturalized members. And all are plants as well-known to present day Englishmen as they were to Shakspere's audience and form an intimate part of their daily lives.

III. The Color and Perfume of Plants

Shakspere does not mention many colors; those he does use are individual and definite. This characteristic of his may not be a virtue, but, at any rate, the adverse criticism that I often hear applied to nature-lovers cannot be applied to him; often friends of mine say that naturalists bore them by using hybrid colors like blue-green and reddish-orange to describe the plants of their delight, but Shakspere resorts to no such device. To him, young wheat was green, ripe wheat was white, and cowslips were gold. He wrote of purple grapes, green figs, brown furze, green holly, and crimson roses; consequently, it might be said that the colors of the plants are not accurately described, but it seems to me that the adjectives he chose are far more suggestive than any awkward, manufactured terms could be. Shakspere, like most people of his time, evidently was more aware of plant fragrance than we are, probably because he was also aware of more disagreeable odors than we are today. At any rate, passages in the plays indicate keen discrimination among odors. "Stinking elder" may not be a pleasant phrase,

but to many people it is accurate; but we find also "'faint primroses," "sweet honeysuckle," and "hot lavender." In Laertes' prayer for Ophelia is borne the idea that the pure human body is resolved to earth which brings forth fragrant life again.

> "And from her fair and unpolluted flesh
> May violets spring;"

And certainly no words ever conveyed the perfume of violets as truly as do those of the Duke in *Twelfth Night,* when in tribute to the music, he sings,

> "O, it came o'er my ear like the sweet sough
> That breathes upon a bank of violets,
> Stealing and giving odor."

So that though the English language may lack specific words that describe fragrance, Shakspere's choice of adjectives and associations is remarkably suggestive of many of the most subtle and delicate.

IV. Individual Plants and Plant Sociology

Shakspere recognized specific form and habit in plants. Earlier I have said that specific differences among trees were apparent to him, because from his brief characterization, it is often possible to say to what particular species he was referring. This knowledge was not confined to large and superficial differences. At night the dew decked with liquid pearl the "bladed" grass; filberts "cluster;" Moss is "furred;" willow-leaves are "hoary;" violets "nod" on their stalks; the twigs of elm are ringed with bark; acorns are cupped; knot-grass grows in a tangled, "hindering" mat, and the cowslip's flower is a "bell." Helena's simile,

> "Like to a double cherry,
> Two lovely berries moulded on one stem,"

describes in poetic language a common anomaly in nature. Often Prospero refers to the "knotty entrails of the oak," a phrase perhaps more expressive of the complicated internal structure of an oak than "bast, and rays, and wood fibres" could ever be.

To a certain degree, Shakspere was conscious of the arrangement of plants in relation to other plants and to other

factors of their environment. "The turfy mountain" well describes low, rolling English hills with their covering of sod. "The rank of osiers" and "primrose-beds" express the habits of one kind growing in a community. English elms truly support luxuriant ivy, and Ariel leads his drunken trio through a good natured succession when he takes them through a thicket of briers and thorns into the algae-mantled pool where he leaves them wallowing in the slime. Shakspere's individual plants are not free from troubles; they have storms and diseases with which to contend. "Through the sharp hawthorn blows the cold wind," "scalding winds rive the knotty oaks," and "the canker galls the infants of the spring." Sometimes, I think the poet's imagination ran away with him, for instance, when we come upon,

> "A bank where the wild thyme blows,
> Where oxlips and the nodding violet grows,
> Quite over-canopied with luscious woodbine,
> With sweet muskroses and with eglantine."

Such a bank is a little too luscious to be probable, but of course, it was located in fairyland, where we are not surprised at anything.

V. Plants and the Moods of the Plays

To a certain extent the moods of some of the plays are set by the kinds of plants that are part of them. The titles of the plays are sometimes misleading, for *The Winter's Tale* illustrates the use of midsummer flowers and spring-blooming flowers. In the first three acts, no flowers at all are found; it is a dark time—a time of suspicion, accusation, death, and remorse; and then Autolycus, the rogue, closes the door on winter and calls forth the sunshine with his song,

> "When daffodils begin to peer—"

Then in the shepherd's cottage, the guests assemble for the sheep-shearing feast, and Perdita distributes her warm, summer flowers—lavender, mint, marjoram, and marigolds —to the aging king and Camillo, but only the sweetest flowers of spring are fit for Florizel, her lover, and she longs for

> "daffodils
> That come before the summer dares, and take

> The winds of Mach with beauty; violets dim,
> But sweeter than the lids of Juno's eyes
> Or Cytherea's breath; pale primroses,
> That die unmarried; . . . . .
> bold oxlips and
> The Crown imperial; lilies of all kinds,
> The flower-de-luce being one."

There is only that one short passage, but it catches the love of Perdita and the prince and pervades the play to its end.

The night of *A Midsummer-Night's Dream* is warm and dewy and luscious, fragrant with the scent of summer flowers and lush with mature summer vegetation. Grass is thick and succulent, fruit heavy and ripe, and vines entangle the forest trees. It is not hard to see "the fountain clear," "the spangled starlight sheen," and "the bank where the wild thyme blows."

In *The Tempest,* the love of Miranda and Ferdinand shines as brightly as does that of Perdita and Florizel; but, for all that, it is Prospero's play, the riches of his life gathered together at harvest-time. The mood of the play is autumnal throughout; in fact, the first three acts are almost gloomily so. Weary Gonzalo longs for furze browned by the summer's sun, knotted oaks shade the island, and the season's growth of thorns and briers forms thick tangles around the bogs. But after Ferdinand has proven himself worthy of Miranda's love, when all of the bad people have been properly punished, and all of the good people are properly rewarded, when all are at last in their proper levels, then all of the goddesses and nymphs of the harvest appear and turn everything to shining gold and purple. Ceres offers all her grain—wheat, rye, barley, and oats, all warm and golden; purple grapes and all ripe fruits; and the sunburned sickle-men and maidens dance in their rye-straw hats for the lovers. Ariel gets his freedom and after summer will fly on the bat's back until another spring hangs blossoms from the bough.

The mood of *Hamlet* is too somber to be one-seasonal; it is year-'round, and characterized by somber plants. Hamlet's world is bitter, all "wormwood, wormwood." His mind associates all he sees with nature's troubles—his uncle is

like "the mildewed ear," and he talks to Polonius about old men "with eyes purging thick amber and plum-tree gum." Even Laertes knows that "the canker galls the infants of spring." Ophelia, sweet and springlike as she is, garlands herself with gloomy weeds—crowflowers, nettles, daisies, long purples or dead-men's fingers, and drowns in a pool aslant which mournful willows hang. The whole mood of the play is somber.

In almost all of the plays, some such use of plants may be found, and usually the plants chosen and the choice of descriptive words or names are extremely successful in setting a mood.

VI. Conclusion

It certainly would be stretching a point to attribute to Shakspere any systematic knowledge of plant life. He knew an amazing variety of plants, both native and exotic, by name; and he knew their colors, forms, fragrances, and times of blooming remarkably well. He was sensitive and humanly sympathetic with the differences in the life of different plants, so that he was what we should call today a naturalist in a sense, but by no means a biologist. He learned what he knew direct from outdoor observation and not from books. In his plays he never used plants for their own sakes, or for an exhibition of his knowledge. He saw them as an integral part of his world, and that is their place in the plays. We find them there as we know them, described without apparent effort and often with extraordinary accuracy.

Common Name	*Scientific Name*	*Reference*	*Act*	*Scene*	*Line*
Aconite	Aconitum sp.?	*II Henry IV*	iv	4	48
Almond	Prunus Amygdalus	*Troilus & Cressida*	v	2	194
Apple	Pyrus malus	*The Tempest*	ii	1	91
		The Merchant of Venice	i	3	102
		The Taming of the Shrew	iv	2	101
		The Taming of the Shrew	i	1	139
		Twelfth Night	v	1	230
		Twelfth Night	i	5	167
		Henry V	iii	7	155
		Henry VIII	v	4	64
		King Lear	i	5	16

Common Name	*Scientific Name*	*Reference*	*Act*	*Scene*	*Line*
Apricot	Prunus Armeniaca	*Midsummer-Night's Dream*	iii	1	169
		King Richard II	iii	4	29
Arabian Gum Tree	Acacia senegal	*Othello*	v	2	350
Ash	Fraxinus excelsior	*Coriolanus*	iv	5	114
Aspen	Populus tremula	*II Henry IV*	ii	4	117
		Titus Andronicus	ii	4	45
Bay	Laurus nobilis	*Richard II*	ii	4	8
Barley	Hordeum vulgare	*The Tempest*	iv	1	61
		Henry V	iii	5	19
Beans	Vicia Faba	*I Henry IV*	ii	1	9
		Midsummer-Night's Dream	ii	1	45
Birch	Betula alba	*Measure for Measure*	i	3	24
Box	Buxus sempervirens	*Twelfth Night*	ii	5	18
Bramble	Rubus fruticosus and Rubus caesius	*As You Like It*	iii	2	380
Broom	Cytisus scoparius	*The Tempest*	iv	1	66
Burdock	Arctium Lappa	*King Lear*	iv	4	3
Cabbage	Brassica oleracea	*The Merry Wives of Windsor*	i	1	124
Carnation	Dianthus caryophyllus	*The Winter's Tale*	iv	4	82
Cedar	Cedrus libanitica	*The Tempest*	v	1	48
		Love's Labor Lost	iv	3	88
		II Henry VI	v	1	205
		III Henry VI	v	2	11
		Richard III	i	3	264
		Henry VIII	v	5	54
		Coriolanus	v	3	60
		Titus Andronicus	iv	3	45
		Cymbeline	v	4	141
		Cymbeline	v	5	453
		Cymbeline	v	5	457
Cherry	Prunus Cerasus	*Midsummer-Night's Dream*	iii	2	209
		King John	ii	1	162
		Henry VIII	v	1	169
Clover	Trifolium sp.?	*Henry V*	v	2	49
Columbine	Aquilegia vulgaris	*Love's Labor Lost*	v	2	661
		Hamlet	iv	5	180
Cowslip	Primula officinalis	*Cymbeline*	i	5	83
		The Tempest	v	1	89
		Midsummer-Night's Dream	ii	1	15
		Midsummer-Night's Dream	ii	1	10
		Henry V	v	2	49
		Cymbeline	ii	2	39
Crowflower	Caltha palustris	*Hamlet*	iv	7	170
Crown Imperial	Fritillaria imperialis	*The Winter's Tale*	iv	4	126
Cuckoo-flower	Arisoema triphyllum or Cardamine pratensis	*King Lear*	iv	4	3

Common Name	*Scientific Name*	*Reference*	*Act*	*Scene*	*Line*
Cypress	Cupressus sempervirens	*Twelfth Night*	ii	4	53
		Twelfth Night	iii	1	132
		II Henry VI	iii	2	323
		Coriolanus	i	10	30
Daffodil	Narcissus pseudo-narcissus	*The Winter's Tale*	iv	3	1
		The Winter's Tale	iv	4	118
Daisy	Bellis perennis	*Hamlet*	iv	7	170
Date	Phoenix dactylifera	*The Winter's Tale*	iv	3	49
		Romeo and Juliet	iv	4	2
Dock	Rumex sp.?	*The Tempest*	ii	1	144
		Henry V	v	1	52
Eglantine	Rose rubiginosa	*Midsummer-Night's Dream*	ii	1	252
		Cymbeline	iv	2	223
Elder	Sambucus nigra	*Cymbeline*	iv	2	60
		Titus Andronicus	ii	3	272
		Titus Andronicus	ii	3	277
Elm	Ulmus campestris	*The Comedy of Errors*	ii	2	176
		Midsummer-Night's Dream	iv	1	47
		II Henry IV	ii	4	358
Fern	?	*I Henry IV*	ii	1	96
		I Henry IV	ii	1	98
Fig	Ficus Carica	*King John*	ii	1	162
		Midsummer-Night's Dream	iii	1	170
		Anthony & Cleopatra	i	2	32
		Anthony & Cleopatra	v	2	235
		Anthony & Cleopatra	v	2	342
Flower-de-luce	Lilium or Iris spp.	*The Winter's Tale*	iv	4	127
Fumitory	Fumaria media	*King Lear*	iv	4	3
Furze	Ulex europaeus	*The Tempest*	i	1	70
		The Tempest	iv	1	180
Garlic	Allium sativum	*Measure for Measure*	iii	2	195
		Midsummer-Night's Dream	iv	2	43
		The Winter's Tale	iv	4	162
		I Henry IV	iii	1	162
Gillyflower	Cheiranthus Cheiri or a variety of Dianthus caryophyllus	*The Winter's Tale*	iv	4	82
Ginger	Zingiber officinale	*The Winter's Tale*	iv	3	48
Grape	Vitis vinifera	*The Tempest*	iv	1	112
Grass	Family Gramineae	*The Tempest*	ii	1	52
		Midsummer-Night's Dream	i	1	211
		The Merchant of Venice	i	1	18
		King Richard II	iii	3	100
		Henry V	i	1	165
		Henry V	iv	2	50
		Henry V			
		II Henry VI	iii	2	337
		Hamlet	iii	2	358

Common Name	*Scientific Name*	*Reference*	*Act*	*Scene*	*Line*
Harebell	Campanula rotundifolia	*Cymbeline*	iv	2	222
Hawthorn	Crataegus Oxyacantha	*As You Like It*	iii	2	380
		King Lear	iii	4	47
		King Lear	iii	4	102
		Midsummer-Night's Dream	iii	1	4
		Midsummer-Night's Dream	i	1	185
		Merry Wives of Windsor	iii	3	77
		III Henry VI	ii	5	42
Heather	Calluna vulgaris	*The Tempest*	i	1	70
Hemlock	Conium maculatum	*Henry V*	v	2	45
		Macbeth	iv	1	25
		King Lear	iv	4	4
Holly	Ilex Aquifolium	*As You Like It*	ii	7	180
		As You Like It	ii	7	183
Honeysuckle	Lonicera Periclymenum	*Midsummer-Night's Dream*	iv	1	47
		Much Ado About Nothing	iii	1	8
Ivy	Hedera Helix	*The Tempest*	i	2	88
		Comedy of Errors	ii	2	180
		Midsummer-Night's Dream	iv	1	46
Knotgrass	Polygonum sp.?	*Midsummer-Night's Dream*	iii	2	329
Ladysmock	Cardamine sp.?	*Love's Labor Lost*	v	2	905
Lavender	Lavandula Spica	*Tha Winter's Tale*	iv	4	104
Leek	Allium porrum	*Midsummer-Night's Dream*	v	1	342
		Henry V	v	1	342
		Henry V	v	1	39
Lemon	Citrus Medica Limonum	*Love's Labor Lost*	v	2	653
Lily	Lilium sp.?	*The Winter's Tale*	iv	4	126
		Love's Labor Lost	v	2	352
Love-in-Idleness (Pansy)	Viola tricolor	*Midsummer-Night's Dream*	ii	1	168
Mace	Myristica fragrans	*The Winter's Tale*	iv	3	47
Mallow	Malva sylvestris	*The Tempest*	ii	1	144
Mandrake	Mandragora officinarum	*Othello*	iii	3	330
		Antony & Cleopatra	i	5	4
		II Henry IV	i	2	17
		II Henry IV	iii	2	339
		II Henry IV	iii	2	310
		Romeo and Juliet	iv	3	47
Marigold	Calendula officinalis	*The Winter's Tale*	iv	4	104
Marjoram	Origanum majorana	*The Winter's Tale*	iv	4	104
Medlar	Pyrus germanica	*Measure for Measure*	iv	3	184
		As You Like It	iii	2	125
		Timon of Athens	iv	3	305
		Romeo and Juliet	ii	1	34

Common Name	*Scientific Name*	*Reference*	*Act*	*Scene*	*Line*
Mildew (Wheat)	Erysiphe graminis (probably)	*King Lear*	iii	4	123
		Hamlet	iii	4	64
Mint	Mentha sp.?	*The Winter's Tale*	iv	4	104
Mistletoe	Viscum album	*Titus Andronicus*	ii	3	95
Moss	Class-Musci or probably Lichens	*A Comedy of Errors*	ii	2	180
		Titus Andronicus	ii	3	95
		I Henry IV	iii	1	33
		As You Like It	iv	3	105
		Timon of Athens	iv	3	223
		Cymbeline	iv	2	228
Mulberry	Morus nigra	*Midsummer-Night's Dream*	iii	1	170
		Midsummer-Night's Dream	v	1	149
		Coriolanus	iii	2	79
Mushroom	Agaricus sp.?	*Midsummer-Night's Dream*	iii	1	156
Mustard (seed)	Sinapis alba	*The Tempest*	v	1	39
Narcissus	Narcissus sp.?	*Two Noble Kinsmen*	ii	2	130
Nettle	Urtica dioica	*Hamlet*	iv	7	170
Nutmeg	Myristica fragrans	*The Winter's Tale*	iv	3	48
Oak	Quercus Ilex of Robur	*The Tempest*	i	2	294
		The Tempest	v	1	45
		The Merry Wives of Windsor	iv	4	31
		The Merry Wives of Windsor	iv	4	40
		The Merry Wives of Windsor	iv	4	42
		The Merry Wives of Windsor	iv	6	19
		The Merry Wives of Windsor	v	1	12
		The Merry Wives of Windsor	v	3	15
		The Merry Wives of Windsor	v	5	79
		Measure for Measure	ii	2	116
		Much Ado About Nothing	ii	1	247
		Love's Labor Lost	iv	2	112
		Midsummer-Night's Dream	i	2	113
		As You Like It	ii	1	31
		As You Like It	iv	3	105
		The Winter's Tale	ii	3	90
		III Henry IV	ii	1	55
		Troilus & Cressida	i	3	50
		Coriolanus	i	1	185
		Coriolanus	i	3	16
		Coriolanus	ii	2	102

Common Name	*Scientific Name*	*Reference*	*Act*	*Scene*	*Line*
		Coriolanus	v	2	117
		Coriolanus	v	3	153
		Timon of Athens	iv	3	264
		Timon of Athens	iv	3	422
		Julius Caesar	i	3	6
		Othello	ii	1	8
		Cymbeline	iv	2	267
		King Lear	iii	2	5
Oats	Avena sativa	*The Tempest*	iv	1	61
		Midsummer-Night's Dream	iv	1	34
		Taming of the Shrew	iii	2	207
		I Henry IV	ii	1	14
		King Lear	v	3	38
Olive	Olea europaea	*As You Like It*	iii	5	75
		As You Like It	iv	3	78
		Twelfth Night	i	5	226
Onion	Allium Cepa	*Midsummer-Night's Dream*	iv	2	43
		All's Well that Ends Well	v	3	321
Orange	Citrus Aurantium	*Much Ado About Nothing*	ii	1	305
		Much Ado About Nothing	iv	1	33
Palm	Phoenix dactylifera	*Julius Caesar*	i	2	131
Peach	Prunus Persica	*II Henry IV*	ii	2	17
Pear	Pyrus communis	*Merry Wives of Windsor*	iv	5	103
		All's Well That Ends Well	i	1	175
Pease	Pisum sativum	*II Henry IV*	ii	4	413
		I Henry IV	ii	1	9
		The Tempest	iv	1	64
Pignut	Conopodium majus	*The Tempest*	ii	2	172
Pine	Pinus sylvestris and other species	*The Tempest*	i	2	277
		The Tempest	i	2	293
		The Tempest	v	1	48
		Merchant of Venice	iv	1	75
		The Winter's Tale	ii	1	34
		Richard II	iii	2	42
		II Henry VI	ii	3	45
		Troilus & Cressida	i	3	8
		Anthony & Cleopatra	iv	12	1
		Anthony & Cleopatra	iv	12	23
		Cymbeline	iv	2	175
Plum	Prunus communis	*King John*	ii	1	162
		II Henry VI	ii	1	101
Pomegranate	Punica Granatum	*All's Well That Ends Well*	ii	3	276
		Romeo and Juliet	iii	5	4
Pond Scum	Class—Algae	*Merchant of Venice*	i	1	92
		The Tempest	iv	1	183
		King Lear	iii	4	132

Common Name	*Scientific Name*	*Reference*	*Act*	*Scene*	*Line*
Poppy	Papaver somniferum	*Othello*	iii	3	330
Potato	Solanum tuberosum	*Merry Wives of Windsor*	iv	5	21
Primrose	Primula veris	*The Winter's Tale*	iv	4	122
		II Henry VI	iii	2	63
		Cymbeline	i	5	83
		Cymbeline	iv	2	221
Quince	Cydonia vulgaris	*Romeo and Juliet*	iv	4	2
Radish	Raphanus sativus	*I Henry IV*	ii	4	206
		II Henry IV	iii	2	334
Rhubarb	Rheum Rhaponticum	*Macbeth*	v	3	55
Rice	Oryza sativa	*The Winter's Tale*	iv	3	38
Rose	Rosa sp.?	*Midsummer-Night's Dream*	ii	1	108
		Midsummer-Night's Dream	ii	1	254
Rosemary	Rosmarinus officinalis	*The Winter's Tale*	iv	4	47
		Romeo and Juliet	ii	4	219
		Romeo and Juliet	iv	5	79
		Hamlet	iv	5	175
		King Lear	ii	3	16
Rue	Ruta graveolens	*The Winter's Tale*	iv	4	74
		King Richard II	iii	4	105
		Hamlet	iv	5	181
Rushes	Juncus sp.?	*As You Like It*	iii	2	389
Rye	Lolium perenne	*The Tempest*	iv	1	61
		The Tempest	iv	1	136
		As You Like It	v	3	23
Saffron	Crocus sativus	*The Tempest*	iv	3	46
Sedge	Family—Cyperaceae	*Much Ado About Nothing*	ii	1	210
		Taming of the Shrew	Ind.	2	3, 55
		I Henry IV	i	3	98
Senna	Cassia acutifolia	*Macbeth*	v	3	55
Squash	Cucurbita sp.?	*Midsummer-Night's Dream*	iii	1	191
		The Winter's Tale	i	2	160
Strawberry	Fragaria sp.?	*King Richard III*	iii	4	34
		Henry V	i	1	60
Sycamore	Acer pseudo-platanus	*Love's Labor Lost*	v	2	89
		Romeo and Juliet	i	1	128
		Othello	iv	3	41
Thyme	Thymus Serpyllum vulgaris	*Midsummer-Night's Dream*	ii	1	249
		Othello	i	3	326
Vetch	Vicia sp.?	*The Tempest*	iv	1	61
Violet	Viola sp.?	*Midsummer-Night's Dream*	ii	1	250
		Twelfth Night	i	1	6
		Hamlet	v	1	263
Walnut	Juglans regia	*Merry Wives of Windsor*	iv	2	171
		Taming of the Shrew	iv	3	66

Common Name	*Scientific Name*	*Reference*	*Act*	*Scene*	*Line*
Wheat	Triticum vulgare	*The Tempest*	iv	1	61
		Midsummer-Night's Dream	i	1	185
		Merchant of Venice	i	1	115
		II Henry IV	v	1	16
		Troilus & Cressida	i	1	15
		King Lear	iii	4	123
Willow	Salix sp.?	*Othello*	iv	3	41
		Much Ado About Nothing	ii	1	194
		Much Ado About Nothing	ii	1	225
		Hamlet	iv	7	167
Woodbine	Lonicera Periclymenum	*Much Ado About Nothing*	iii	1	30
		Midsummer-Night's Dream	ii	1	251
		Midsummer-Night's Dream	iv	1	47
Wormwood	Artimesia campestris	*Hamlet*	iii	2	191
		Romeo and Juliet	i	3	26
Yew	Taxus baccata	*Twelfth Night*	ii	4	56
		Richard II	iii	2	117
		Titus Andronicus	ii	3	107
		Macbeth	iv	1	27
		Romeo and Juliet	v	3	3
		Romeo and Juliet	v	3	137

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Dyer, T. F. Thiselton. Folk Lore of Shakespeare. Chapter VIII. Griffith and Farran. London. 1883.
2. Ellacombe, H. N. Plant Lore and Garden Craft of Shakespeare.
3. Singleton, Esther. The Shakespeare Garden. Century Co. New York. 1922.

SHAKSPERE AND MUSIC

By MARIO CASTELNUOVO-TEDESCO

IF there exists one poet in all dramatic literature who "calls forth music," undoubtedly he is Shakspere: the harmony of his verse, the musicality of his images, the astonishing variety of his expressions, have inspired and will always inspire musicians. He himself loved music, and understood it, and it would be interesting to list his numerous citations concerning instruments, musical theory (he even understood the Pythagorian theory of the "music of the spheres"), and his splendid and moving observations on music and its effects; but for lack of space, we must refer the reader to the work (thoroughly complete from this aspect) of Edward W. Naylor, *Shakespeare and Music.* Finally, what is most important, in almost every play, he himself asked for musical collaboration as a necessary element for completing the poetic expression; in general under the twofold guise of "songs" and instrumental commentary. Sometimes the "songs" are intimately linked with the dramatic expression, at other times they have rather the character of divertissement, or interpolation. Probably he was sometimes inspired by already existing "songs," perhaps he modeled his verses on well-known tunes; in any case several of these "songs" have come down to us with the music of the period, so-called "traditional." As for instrumental commentary, the directions in the text are more vague: fanfares, dances, at times some indications of instruments (flutes, oboes, lutes, viols, horns, trumpets). We know that Shakspere had an orchestra in the Globe Theatre which underlined dramatic passages and played in the intermissions: a little orchestra composed of varied instruments, sometimes plaintive, more often boisterous, which must have resembled a "jazz band" more or less (and let none cry sacrilege! For very probably we would have to employ something like it today if we wanted to approach as nearly as possible Shakspere's intentions . . .).

*

If, then, we want to follow the "musical lot of Shakspere through the centuries," we must (before adventuring on

the subject of the many operas inspired by his plays) consider these two aspects (that of "song" and instrumental music) as the most "legitimate," those which he himself asked for, that he deemed essential.

The songs . . . : there are hundreds (if not thousands) of Shaksperian songs, stemming from all ages, and in all countries: from the "traditional" and from the old English Arne and Purcell (later we shall speak at greater length of Purcell and his operas), to the most modern. In a song from *As You Like It,* "It was a lover and his lass," we have famous examples from the Frenchman, Jean Philippe Rameau (1683-1764) up to the contemporary English composer, Vaughan Williams. Of these songs, some were destined for the theatre, some quite simply for concert; among the latter everyone knows the two famous *Lieder* of Schubert, *Who is Sylvia,* and *Hark, Hark, the Lark,* charming bits, even if detached from the original Shaksperian atmosphere. On the contrary, the *Five Songs of Ophelia,* little known and but recently published,[1] of Johannes Brahms, who composed them (in 1873, from the translation of Schlegel and Tieck) at the request of Joseph Lewinsky, were destined for the theatre, in fact for performnaces at the Vienna Burgtheater. And if, having passed the period of the German Lied, we reach the moderns, we shall find them (leaving aside the numerous English composers) in the Frenchmen, Chausson, Sauguet, Satie (with the astonishing title: (*Five Grimaces pour un songe d'une unit d'été—Five Grimaces for a summer night's dream*), and even in Sibelius. Let me also observe that I, too, fervent admirer of Shakspere, having studied the beauty and possibilities of his theatre for many years, composed (between 1921 and 1925) the entire cycle of thirty-three *Shakespeare's Songs,*[2] taken from the tragedies and comedies and set to music on the original text, the most complete attempt up to the present, I believe, in this genre by a single musician.

* *

Now let us turn to instrumental music. But here we must first dispose of a rather disturbing chapter . . . : was Beethoven really inspired by Shakspere in most of his last Sonatas and Quartets? Arnold Schering believes so:[3] starting with a remark by Schindler, contemporary and friend

of Beethoven, to whom Beethoven himself was supposed to have said, apropos of his Piano Sonata, op. 31, No. 2, that if he had read *The Tempest,* he would have found in it the "key to this Sonata," Schering not only plunged into the most audacious of suppositions, but into the most astonishing of analyses in imagining that Beethoven, in practically all his last instrumental compositions, had written music "with a key" (and consequently "with a program") passing in "review" the whole Shaksperian theatre (which he himself knew in the German translations of Schlegel and Tieck). Ingenious and perhaps attractive hypothesis, but absolutely gratuitous (leaving aside the unlikelihood of such a "mystery" shrouding to the present day the intimate source of a part of the most important Beethovenian creations). But, even having disposed of this problem, there remains a great deal more Shaksperian music to examine, and that in several instrumental forms.

In the 19th century, the tendency of musicians to idealize, romanticize, and amplify, brought them by preference to the Overture form, in which rather than follow step by step the unfolding of a play, they expressed their "personal impression" of the play itself. It is here that Mendelssohn gave us a masterpiece with his Overture to *A Midsummer Night's Dream,* written at the age of 18 . . .: a model still unsurpassed for grace and fantasy. Another well-known example is that of Tschaikowsky; with *Romeo and Juliet* (and with another quite inferior Overture to *Hamlet*) he further enlarged the form and the frame, calling them *Overture-Fantasies.* But even more intolerant of form, Berlioz threw himself into the symphony, in *Romeo and Juliet,* or at least in what he calls a symphony . . . : strange "pastiche" with some parts sung and others recited, in which are found all the qualities and all the faults of Berlioz: from the inimitable grace and miraculous invention of *The Queen Mab* Scherzo to the insufferable vulgarity of "The Feast in the Capulet's House" . . . But I believe just the same that the Overture form can find marvelous sources of inspiration in the theatre of Shakspere; and I have composed five: (*The Taming of the Shrew, Twelfth Night, The Merchant of Venice, Julius Caesar, The Winter's Tale*[4]), and I am thinking of continuing the cycle.

The symphonic poem has also rendered homage to Shakspere with *Macbeth,* one of the first, but also one of the weakest, among the tone poems of Richard Strauss. But let us now examine the "incidental music," that is to say, the music truly destined to follow the performances, according to the intention of the poet—music which naturally differs greatly according to the tastes of the period and the occasions for which it was composed: from the ingeniousness of the primitive "adaptations" to the wider and more complex forms (as I said) of the romantic composers, and to the more daring conceptions of the moderns. There again Mendelssohn offered one of the most luminous examples with his music for *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (written several years after the Overture) and some of these pieces (like the "Nocturne" and "Scherzo") remain models, even though bound to a conception more romantic than Shaksperian. But we would have to list a great many more examples: Humperdinck (*Winter's Tale*), Korngold (*Much Ado About Nothing*), Faure (with his music for *Shylock,* so beautiful an adaptation of *The Merchant of Venice,* written by the French poet, Alfred de Vigny), Debussy (with his *Music for King Lear,* incidentally of little significance and posthumously published), Florent Schmitt (*Anthony and Cleopatra,* written for the Andre Gide translation and for the performances of Ida Rubenstein in 1921), Auric (*As You Like It*), Pizzetti (again *As You Like It:* for the productions of the Florence May Festival in 1937), etc.

* * *

But now we must approach the problem of the collaboration of musicians with Shakspere in a freer, more imposing, more subjective form (and, sometimes, even arbitrary) but important nevertheless: opera! It is quite natural that musicians found a host of "pretexts" which always "tempted," almost "haunted" them in the extraordinary richness of the Shaksperian theatre; but there also, the "fruit," the result, differs greatly with the tastes and the times (without even considering the personal talent of different composers).

By the middle of the 17th century, a name already presents and imposes itself, a name deservedly famous: Henry Purcell: a man of genius, "the good genius" of English

music . . . and, among his numerous operas, he wrote several under Shaksperian inspiration: *Timon of Athens, King Richard the Second* (1681), *The Fairy Queen* (taken from *Midsummer Night's Dream;* in 1692), and *The Tempest* (in the last year of his life, 1695.) However, if we still admire in him the sobriety of his "recitatives" (which stem both from Lulli and Carissimi), if we can still enjoy some of his very florid "arias" (where the words repeat themselves ad infinitum . . .) we especially appreciate qualities of "style," the first flowering of the baroque opera;" it would be more difficult to find there the true expression of Shaksperian creatures . . . We must add besides that Purcell, although English, did not have recourse to the original text of Shakspere (a fact which greatly diminishes his importance, but he employed the adaptations of librettists often unfortunate, as for instance, Shadwell, whom his contemporaries called "the assassin of Shakespeare!" And what assassinations were committed later by librettists (Italian and French) at the expense of Shakspere! Strange: we might say that, by a procedure converse to that of Shakspere, who often borrowed the subjects of his tragedies and comedies from foreign sources (particularly Italian "contes"), transforming and "sublimating" them, librettists reverted to the subjects of Shakspere, and transformed them in their turn, but betraying and debasing them . . . One of the plays which has had the "worst fate," both as text and as music, has been *Romeo and Juliet.* Even Bellini, in his *Capuleti e Montecchi,* wrote one of his most mediocre operas; that of Gounod, played more often, is only a superficial French "comic opera" and the more recent one of Zandonai, bombastic and noisy, has nothing of the intimate and plaintive grace of the lovers of Verona. Let us leave to oblivion the almost ridiculous *Hamlet* of A. Thomas . . . . *Othello,* on the contrary, had two great interpreters: Rossini and Verdi. It is said that Rossini remarked that what would survive of his music would be the entire *Barber of Seville,* the second act of *William Tell* and the third act of *Othello;* unfortunately, in spite of the undeniable beauties of this third act, the opera (based on an absurd libretto of Castil Blaze) has not survived. It is quite otherwise with Verdi . . .; but before speaking of *Othello,* we must mention *Macbeth,* which was his first Shaksperian attempt; composed to

a mediocre libretto by Piave, it is, inspite of good dramatic intentions, a dull and deficient opera, which has been revived recently in vain. Afterwards Verdi thought of *King Lear* for a long time, but after several efforts he gave it up. It was Boito who brought him back to Shakspere, and Boito was an intelligent, cultivated man; but so imbued with German romanticism that quite often he wandered far from the true Shaksperian spirit, and, for example, transformed Iago into a sort of Goethian Mephisto. Nevertheless, because of the genius of Verdi, *Othello* is powerful lyric drama and attains a supreme beauty and an astonishing tragic expression, especially in the last act. However, other operas of Verdi contain a more vigorous vitality, and I think that Verdi, had he lived, would have gone farther in his dramatic conception. On the contrary, I cannot imagine that he would have been able to create something more accomplished than *Falstaff* in comedy: there is a perfect opera, miraculous in perfection and youth; it is still the most "modern" opera the Italian theatre has produced, and even if still not completely understood and appreciated by musicians and public, that is the road we must follow, if we still wish to compose musical comedies . . . Naturally, it leaves the modest *Merry Wives of Windsor* of Nicolai far behind, as I believe (although I am not acquainted with it) it also does *Sir John in Love,* on the same subject, of Vaughan Williams, who is, however, the first one who "dared" adopt, in part, the original Shaksperian text. Recently in Italy there has appeared a series of Shaksperian operas, *Romeo and Juliet* of Zandonai (which I already mentioned), *The Tempest* of Lattuada, *The Taming of the Shrew* of Persico (and that same comedy had inspired the Swiss composer, Goetz, in the past century), *King Lear* of Frazzi, *Julius Caesar* and *Anthony and Cleopatra* of Malipiero, but all more or less deficient: those of Malipiero are the most interesting, because of a certain sobriety which resembles, in a sense, Monteverdi, but they also lack a true vitality. In France Reynaldo Hahn recently composed a *Merchant of Venice,* which I do not know, but which I suppose is an amiable "comic opera" . . . But undoubtedly the most interesting of contemporary Shaksperian operas is *Macbeth* by Ernest Bloch; composed on a beautiful French adaptation by Edmond Fleg, this work has all the characteristics of the talent of its vigorous and profound

author. Presented for the first time in Paris in 1913, it was recently repeated in Italy with sensational success; I should like to see it played more often, I should like the American public to know it. . . .

* * * *

But is opera truly the ideal form to express the humanity, the fantasy, the poetic essence of Shakspere, to realize the musical collaboration which the poet wished? That is the real problem (or, to say with Shakspere: "that is the question"). Personally, I doubt it . . .; in each case it is a problem which is bound up in another problem even more vast: that of "musicality and musicability of Shakespeare" and, though his "musicality" is universally recognized, his "musicability" is often argued. Pizzetti (the eminent Italian composer who was my teacher) made it the object of a very interesting study in his *Intermezzi Critici*[5] and he arrived at some rather negative conclusions. But Pizzetti began with a rather unilateral point of view: that is to say that the "musical drama" was the only possible solution. From my point of view, on the contrary, the possibilities of solution are several and different. And above all, we must envisage the problem from two aspects: that of "language" and that of "form."

As for "language," I believe (and I have written so elsewhere) Shakspere is absolutely untranslatable; he cannot be transposed into another language without breaking his poetic charm, without spoiling his miraculous harmony, without (often) betraying his spirit. On the other hand, his English is a perfectly musical language: I dare say (from my experience with it) that it unites the spiritual subtlety of English with the sonorous splendor of Italian. We must therefore approach him in English (and with the original text) and it is perhaps for the musician whose language is English to say the final word on the subject, to recapture and to complete the heritage left unfinished by Purcell.

As concerns "form," I see several possibilities, depending upon the different character of the plays, so prodigious is the versatility of Shakspere. One possibility is, undoubtedly, opera, which means a completely musical and sung version.

But we shall have to renounce, above all, some of the "traditional conventions" of the melodrama: for example, that of grouping several different scenes into the same act. On the contrary, I believe that we would have to respect the division into "tableux" which in Shakspere combines such great effectiveness in contrasts (and which, moreover, for modern scenic means, no longer constitutes a difficulty), and I believe that a "musical drama in tableaux" (of the type of *Boris Godounoff*) would perhaps be the best way of solving tragedies like *Macbeth, Romeo and Juliet, The Merchant of Venice, King Lear,* and even *Hamlet.* The case is different for the comedies: evidently, one cannot always give "musical weight" to the entire text; and then the alternative of music and recitation (in the traditional sense of "incidental music") is still the preferable solution. I think, however, that we must avoid large modern orchestras, often too stuffed, and which have too much "weight;" I feel that a small orchestra, greatly varied in timbres, would better bring into relief the "piquancy" of the comedies, and at the same time would more closely approach the intentions of Shakspere. As for the fairy scenes, in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *The Tempest,* I see another possibility, one which has not, as far as I know, been envisaged up to the present: that of the ballet; possibly a ballet with "songs" and choruses . . . One may object that suppressing the greatest part of the Shaksperian text in this way would also spoil its beauty. However, I believe that the association of music and dance would render better than any other means the poetic and musical essense of these fairy tales, their prodigious fantasy, their almost ethereal lightness, their almost symbolic and abstract worth . . . And what marvelous "rôles" I see for dancers in Oberon, Titania, and Puck; in Prospero, Miranda, Ariel and Caliban! . . . Finally, there is a fourth possibility, which could not have been imagined several years ago, and which perhaps embodies all (and which might in the future offer the best results): that of the cinema, of the association of "music and screen" (This is no blasphemy!). I know attempts have already been made, that there are two examples . . . which one should not follow! that of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (where nothing better could be done from the musical angle than to reproduce the music of Mendelssohn,

admirable in itself, but which does not "belong" from the cinematographic point of view), and *Romeo and Juliet* (where the Capulet ballroom would have been able to hold the entire city of Verona!): both too "spectacular," and that is the danger we must guard against! On the contrary, I see in the "possibilities of synthesis" of the movies what could be the advantages of this form of art, and also in a more simple, more supple, more rapid musical commentary. I see *Macbeth* perfectly with a sombre tragic obsessed music of the kind Honegger wrote for *Crime et Châtiment* (*"Crime and Punishment";*) or *As You Like It,* with music, detached, ironical and tender at the same time, of the type which Auric composed for *À nous la liberté.* But perhaps we are still quite far from this ideal, and we shall have to pass through several unhappy experiences before reaching it.

* * * * *

In any case, whatever the form adopted may be, Shakspere's work, through its extraordinary vitality, its sparkling fantasy, its vibrant humanity, "calls forth" and will always call forth music! And (I wanted to say this at the beginning, but have left it to the end) we must not have too much historical preoccupation!" The work of Shakspere is of such "an eternal quality" (how actually alive his dramas seem to us today!) that the musician can approach them without constraint, without mental reservation, in full confidence that present musical means lend themselves better than those of the past to express such a "sum total of beauty!" And the list of musical works inspired by Shakspere will become (I hope for the future of art) longer and longer . . . .

Larchmont, New York.

---

[1]Schirmer, New York.
[2]J. and W. Chester, London.
[3]*Beethoven in Neuer Deutung.*
[4]Ed. Ricordi. Milan.
[5]*Intermezzi Critici.* Vallecchi. Florence, 1920.

THE CONTINUITY OF SHAKSPERIAN PROSE

By HENRY W. WELLS

THE numerous discussions of Shakspere's style have overlooked the curious discrepancy between the evolution of his verse and prose: while his art of verse passed through several well marked stages, his prose, highly varied at any period as it is, shows no comparable progression. When we say that Shakspere's style develops, to be more exact we should usually say that his verse develops. His early prose is remarkable for maturity, his latest for relative similarity to what precedes it. There are, of course, some interesting transformations. But the evolution fails to strike deep and the great bulk of his prose gives a singularly unified impression. This article traces first the continuity and secondly the less striking lines of change.

Doubtless the reason that among many pages of description little or nothing has been written on the development of the prose is that there is comparatively small development. The contrast in this respect with the verse would, however, seem sufficiently notable to have attracted attention, while his evolution as a verse writer is by no means merely duplicated on a lower scale in the other medium.

Some of the causes for the undramatic story of Shaksperian prose lie close to the surface. One stabilizing factor lies in Shakspere's so-called period of prose, the middle part of his career. Here computations are best made after excluding plays in which collaboration perplexes the issue. The undisputed plays may then be conveniently arranged in three groups: those from the earliest work to *The Merchant of Venice,* those from *Henry Fourth* plays to *Measure for Measure* and *Hamlet,* and those from *Othello* to *The Tempest.* The total number of lines in the first and third group are almost exactly equal; the number in the central group is half again as large. According to our familiar arrangement of the text, the first group has 3309 lines of prose or 14% of its total; the third 4628 lines or 19%, while the central group has 18,242 lines or 49%. In short, while Shakspere's dramatic career covered at least

twenty years, within half a dozen years he wrote well over two-thirds of his total output of prose. These circumstances obviously help to give his prose a better center of gravity than his verse. While he wrote almost the same quantity of verse and prose in his central period, he wrote more verse in either his first and third period than in his second. To study his prose is thus to concentrate upon one period, while to study his verse demands an examination of two widely severed extremes of his career.

These conditions do not, of course, necessitate any stability in his use of prose. He might, indeed, have written still fewer lines of prose in his opening and closing years and still have followed in each a style radically different from that of the other and from the central period, which in turn even within the space of five or six years might show remarkable development. We shall find, however, good evidence showing that such was not the case, as well as the grounds for this conservatism. While, to begin with, it must be granted that some differences exist characterizing the three periods, it must finally be acknowledged that the differences are vastly less important than in the neighboring passages of verse. Anyone of literary taste coming for the first time to Shakspere's plays could presumably place a quotation of a dozen lines of verse in one or another period of the dramatist's life, but it is extremely doubtful if he could do so in the case of prose.

Were we to attempt to describe in a word only such tendencies as distinguish the prose during the three stages, it would perhaps be admissible to call the first euphuistic,[1] the second poetic,[2] and the third baroque.[3] But in accordance with what has already been said, it is likewise true that the euphuistic, or bookish style based on parallelisms, occasionally occurs in both Shakspere's later periods,[4] the baroque tendency, based on subtler elaborations, in both his earlier ones,[5] and a poetic prose sporadically in all three.[6] Thus the differences lie more in delicate shading than in sharply contrasting colors. Nothing approximating the evolution in the verse can be shown. Although often formal, the prose is remarkably free from mannerism or affectation. The verse is prismatic, the prose a white light.

Shakspere was almost surely a greater master of verse

than of prose, giving to the former his best powers and the fruits of his fullest growth. In verse he carried his art farthest. It is at least indicative that besides his plays he left other works in verse and none in prose. In verse he wrote most of his scenes that rise to heights of climax. His tendency is also to give his major characters relatively more verse than his minor ones. The more poetic medium might be likened to the strings of his orchestra. And this emphasis upon verse accompanies an even greater concentration of ingenuity and creative imagination. One explanation of his supreme imagination as a verse writer is the older and richer tradition of verse. The medieval drama is wholly in rhyme, much of it distinctly creditable. Marlowe and his school, followed by Dekker, Chapman, Marston and others, were by 1600 writers of able verse, some of it brilliant. Although Lyly introduced an affected prose into comedy, no powerful prose except by Shakspere was heard on the English stage until Ben Jonson. Shakspere was thus a leader in the introduction of prose into English drama. He was far from a leader in the introduction of verse. The mere use of prose on a large scale was an innovation. It could hardly be expected that so young a medium in dramatic dialogue would as yet equal in force the long established one.

Yet Shakspere was ambidextrous. He touched nothing without adorning it. He wrote prose only a little less readily or brilliantly than verse. Prose, it must always be remembered, is the sole medium for Falstaff, the principal medium for Rosalind and highly conspicuous in the parts of Mercutio, Shylock, Beatrice, Viola, Hamlet, the Duke in *Measure for Measure,* Pandarus, Iago and Lear. It is the principal medium in six comedies which, if not his greatest plays, were at least written at the very height of his powers. In supremely poetic passages it gives us Hamlet's praise of man and the universe, the most perfect of all expressions of Renaissance philosophy, as well as the heart of Falstaff's materialistic humor, the kernel of Iago's Machiavellian cynicism and most of the tragic mad-scenes. It embraces many of Shakspere's most intellectual and most of his humorous lines. Moreover, without his highly conscious and perfected art of shifting between the two forms, his scenes must have lost much of their contrasts of light and shadow,

their energy and animation. These shifts keep the blood stirring and the thought brisk and alive. The very use of prose at all was innovating and audacious, its use beside verse singularly stimulating and its actual quality superb; but beside the verse it seems stylistically conservative. To conclude, the prose lacks the superb rhythms of the verse, the bolder achievements in usage, imagery and syntax.[7] It is more distinguished for its realistic content than for its stylistic miracles. By the discovery of prose Shakspere broadened his dramatic view of life but the wings of the poet always remained freer in verse.

Shakspere's early prose stands, nevertheless, even closer to his greatest poetry than his early verse. His final art of verse developed out of many earlier phases, his prose was born virtually in full stature. It is remarkable how soon he achieved his philosophy of prose and how quickly he realized most of the possibilities within his reach as a prose poet. *Love's Labour's Lost* shows that he understood at an early date the use of prose for comedy,[8] realism,[9] local coloring,[10] characterization,[11] epistles and proclamations which intrude parenthetically into the dialogue,[12] and wit of all sorts, especially sharp dramatic banter.[13] Most of the verse in *Romeo and Juliet* is admitted to have a primitive and declamatory ring,[14] quite foreign to Shakspere's mature poetic style. But the prose of Mercutio and Juliet's Nurse has little by which to date it in the playwright's career.[15] Again, the most celebrated lines by Shylock are the prose speeches,[16] clearly more deeply poetic than the gorgeous verse-rhetoric of *The Merchant of Venice*.[17] Finally, the poetic power of the Falstaff scenes[18] is obviously more imaginative and highly developed than the declamatory verse neighboring it.[19] There are, of course, a few trifling prose scenes in the early comedies, as in the Dromio episodes. But these are entirely competent farce. The prose of Launce is undeniably brilliant.[20] In short, while Shakspere's earliest verse seems at times more reminiscent of Marlowe than prophetic of his own masterpieces, with only the most trivial exceptions his prose always appears mature. He began with a very moderate imitation of the wittier elements in Lyly,[21] almost immediately achieved a high level of his own and never wrote in prose anything by half so audacious or stylistically experimental as the than his verse, though in the long run hardly less pleasing.

verse of *The Tempest.* Verse was his supreme field for literary experiment. Behind his conservatism in the treatment of prose appears a natural conviction that prose should be closer to colloquialism.[22] One form invites the innovations of the poet, the other leans toward the commonly accepted usages of men; verse best represents the creative, prose the imitative aspects of his art.

To the last clowning and humorous characterization call forth a prose not essentially unlike that of the Launce or Bottom scenes. Autolycus, though he may put on a smooth and courtly disguise, is beneath his gay clothes still the jolly clown of early comedy, a flattering reminiscence, as it were, of Tarlton and Kemp in their glory. Thus his language shows no extraordinary change from that of his predecessors. Menenius's talk is but a shade less undignified than that of Juliet's Nurse. And conversely, Launce's dog has a serious aspect prelusive of the uncourtly dogs appearing from time to time in the prose of *King Lear.*[23] The prose scene between Iachimo and Posthumus in *Cymbeline*[24] may well be more deft and accomplished than anything which Shakspere wrote when a less consummate master of his craft; and yet no one has written prose dialogue more economically and effectively than Shakspere in the scene in *Henry Fourth* showing Falstaff feted in Shallow's garden.[25]

Vast as is the range between comedy and tragedy, vulgarity and elegance, the absurd and the poetic in Shaksperian prose, he repeats effects more often in this medium than in verse. The princes in *Much Ado*[26] can be really as courtly as those in *The Winter's Tale.*[27] The art in caricature is much the same in Shallow and in Stephano. Prose signifies a breaking down of the walls of reason no less in the mad scenes of *Hamlet* than in *Macbeth* and *Lear.* Perhaps the prose style of which the poet tired soonest was the vaguely euphuistic repartee obviously intended to be more impromptu and lively than imaginative and profound, the manner reaching its climax in the banter between Benedick and Beatrice.[28] But if there are relatively few parallels to this voluble and lusty fooling in the later plays, few of the earlier ones are without them. It is safe to conclude that there is no major effect in his prose achieved only once or only in a single play. Thus his prose is less astonishing

The great scope and variety undeniably present in the prose may readily be discerned within a few plays written within a short period of his career or, indeed, within almost any one of his great plays, from *Hamlet* to *Antony and Cleopatra.* Where variety itself is so concentrated, we more readily consider Shakspere as a prose poet endowed with an extraordinary richness than picture him passing through clear-cut metamorphoses as a stylist. His highest achievements as a prose poet are attained quite at random. His euphuistic manner reaches its climax in Falstaff's passages of mock eloquence,[29] his use of prose for caricature in Pandarus.[30] His use of it for grotesque effects rises to its heights in the mad-scenes and in the graveyard scene in *Hamlet;*[31] his distinctly tragic prose in the sleep-walking scene in *Macbeth,*[32] and his luscious imaginative prose in the Thersites passages of *Troilus and Cressida*[33] and the Egyptian scenes in *Antony and Cleopatra.*[34] In Shakspere's youth Lyly's euphuism was in fashion; during his last years as playwright he addressed an increasingly courtly audience with new and subtler standards of elegance. For this audience the ever adaptable poet wrote the prose scenes between the gallants in *The Winter's Tale.*[35] The ground between the two extremes is not actually wide.

Shakspere's one outstanding change is to use prose in more and more serious scenes, although the actual style often remains much the same in tragedy and comedy. In such early plays as *Love's Labour's Lost, The Two Gentlemen of Verona* and *A Midsummer-Night's Dream,* the romantic scenes are almost wholly verse, the farcical relief is prose. But the prose scenes steadily gain in weight. Not only the old-fashioned clowns, as Grumio, Costard and Speed, talk prose. Characters obviously of a mixed but more serious import, as Shylock, Benedick and Falstaff, use it. The account of Falstaff's death is in prose. In such rôles as Fluellen in *Henry the Fifth,* Shakspere employs prose in the semi-serious spirit of the Jonsonian comedy of humours, with emphasis upon characterization and eccentricity. Prose is developed in the witty but lyrical love-scenes of *As You Like It* and in more romantic and poetic passages of *Twelfth Night.* The serious-minded and intellectual Duke in *Measure for Measure* employs it as a

feature of his disguise. Meanwhile a strange and wonderful blending of comedy and tragedy characterizes the prose speeches in such parts as Hamlet and Pandarus. Finally, prose at length wins its high place in purely tragic scenes of *Othello, Macbeth* and *King Lear*. Especially in the last we see the evolution complete. Yet it will be noted that a few of the Edmund scenes, graceful and artful as they are, occupy secondary places beside the grandeur of the surrounding verse.[36] They are more courtly than tragic, more deft than poetic. In short, they suggest the last phase of Shakspere's art, represented in the mildly baroque prose of *The Winter's Tale*.

Columbia University
New York, N. Y.

---

[1]If to do were as easy as to know what were good to do, chapels had been churches, and poor men's cottages princes' palaces. It is a good divine that follows his own instructions: I can easier teach twenty what were good to be done than be one of the twenty to follow mine own teaching. The brain may devise laws for the blood; but a hot temper leaps o'er a cold decree: such a hare is madness the youth, to skip o'er the meshes of good counsel the cripple. (*M. of V.*, 1, 2, 11.)

[2]What a piece of work is man! how noble in reason! how infinite in faculty! in form and moving how express and admirable! in action how like an angel! in apprehension how like a god! the beauty of the world! the paragon of animals! And yet, to me, what is this quintessence of dust? man delights not me; nor, nor woman neither, though by your smiling you seem to say so. (*Ham., II,* 2, 3, 3[15].)

[3]Since their more mature dignities and royal necessities made separation of their society, their encounters, though not personal, have been royally attorneyed with interchange of gifts, letters, loving embassies; that they seemed to be together, though absent; shook hands, as over a vast; and embraced, as it were from the ends of opposed winds. (*W. T.*, I, 1, 21.)

[4]Harry, I do not only marvel where thou spendest thy time, but also how thou art accompanied; for though the camomile, the more it is trodden on the faster it grows, yet youth, the more it is wasted the sooner it wears. (*I, Hen. IV,* II, 4, 425.)

Our bodies are gardens; to the which our wills are gardeners; so that if we will plant nettles or sow lettuce, set hyssop and weed up thyme, supply it with one gender of herbs or distract it with many, either to have it sterile with idleness or manured with industry, why, the power and corrigibile authority of this lies in our wills. (*Oth.*, I, 3, 323.)

[5]'So it is, besieged with sable-coloured melancholy, I did commend the black-oppressing humour of the most wholesome physic of thy health-giving air; and, as I am a gentleman, betook myself to walk. (*L. L. L.*, I, 1, 233.)

Sir, his definement suffers no perdition in you; though, I know, to divide him inventorially would dizzy the arithmetic of memory, and yet but yaw neither, in respect of his quick sail. But in the verity of extolment, I take him to be a soul of great article, and his infusion of such dearth and rareness, as, to make true diction of him, his semblable is his mirror, and who else would trace him, his umbrage, nothing more. (*Ham.*, V, 2, 113.)

[6]The curse never fell upon our nation till now; I never felt it till now: two thousand ducats in that; and other precious, precious jewels. I would my daughter were dead at my foot, and the jewels in her ear! would she were hearsed at my foot, and the ducats in her coffin. (*Mer. of V.*, III, 1, 86.)

I saw him run after a gilded butterfly; and when he caught it, he let it go again;

and after it again; and over and over he comes, and up again; catched it again; or whether his fall enraged him, or how 'twas, he did so set his teeth, and tear it; O, I warrant, how he mammocked it! (*Cor.* I, 3, 63.)

[7]If it were done when 'tis done, then 'twere well!
It were done quickly if th' assassination
Would trammel up the consequence, and catch,
With his surcease, success; that but this blow
Might be the be-all and the end-all here,
But here, upon the bank and shoal of time,
We'ld jump the life to come. But in these cases
We still have judgment here; that we but teach
Bloody instructions, which being taught return
To plague th' inventor; this even-handed justice
Commends th' ingredients of our poisoned chalice
To our own lips. (*Mac.*, I, 7, 1.)

[8]The entire secondary plot is comic and largely in prose.

[9]Local allusions are thickly strewn throughout the prose scenes.

[10]Costard's reference to gingerbreak is a pleasing example. (V, I, 71.)

[11]As in the delineation of Nathaniel in the opening of Act V.

[12]The epistle by Don Adriano de Armado, read in V, 1, exemplifies this.

[13]As in the banter between Moth and Armado. (V, I, 1-125.)

[14]O woe! O woeful, woeful, woeful day!
Most lamentable day, most woeful day,
That ever, ever, I did yet behold!
O day! O day! O day! O hateful day!
Never was seen so black a day as this:
O woeful day, O woeful day! (*R and J.*, IV, 5, 49.)

[15]No, 'tis not so deep as a well, nor so wide as a church-door; but 'tis enough, 'twill serve: ask for me to-morrow, and you shall find me a grave man. I am peppered, I warrant, for this world. A plague o' both your houses! 'Zounds, a dog, a rat, a mouse, a cat, to scratch a man to death! a braggart, a rogue, a villain, that fights by the book of arithmetic! Why the devil came you between us? I was hurt under your arm. (*R. and J.*, III, 1, 97.)

An a' speak any thing against me, I'll take him down, an a' were lustier than he is, and twenty such Jacks; and if I cannot, I'll find those that shall. Scurvy knave! I am none of his flirt-gills; I am none of his skains-mates. — And thou must stand by too, and suffer every knave to use me at his pleasure? (*Ibid.*, II, 4, 153.)

[16]*Cf.* note 6.

[17] Let none presume
To wear an undeservëd dignity.
O, that estates, degrees and offices
Were not derived corruptly, and that clear honour
Were purchased by the merit of the wearer!
How many then should cover that stand bare!
How many be commanded that command!
How much low peasantry would than be glean'd
From the true seed of honour! and how much honour
Pick'd from the chaff and ruin of the times
To be new-varnish'd! (*Mer. of V.*, II, 9, 39.)

[18]I do remember him at Clement's Inn like a man made after supper of a cheese-paring; when a' was naked, he was, for all the world, like a forked radish, with a head fantastically carved upon it with a knife: a' was so forlorn, that his dmiensions to any thick sight were invisible: a' was the very genius of famine; yet lecherous as a monkey, and the whores called him mandrake: a' came ever in the rearward of the fashion, and sung those tunes to the over-scutched huswives that he heard the carmen whistle, and sware they were his fancies or his good-nights. And now is this Vice's dagger become a squire, and talks as familiarly of John a Gaunt as if he had been sworn brother to him; and I'll be sworn a' ne'er saw him but once in the Tilt-yard; and then he burst his head for crowding among the marshal's men. (*I Hen. IV*, III, 2, 325.)

[19] You, lord Archbishop,
Whose see is by the civil peace maintain'd,
Whose beard the silver hand of peace hath touch'd,

Whose learning and good letters peace hath tutor'd,
Whose white investments figure innocence,
The dove and very blessëd spirit of peace,
Wherefore do you so ill translate yourself
Out of the speech of peace that bears such grace,
Into the harsh and boisterous tongue of war;
Turning your books to graves, your ink to blood,
Your pens to lances, and your tongue divine
To a loud trumpet and a point of war? (*Ibid, IV,* 1, 41.)

[20]*T. G. of V.,* IV, 4, 1-43.

[21]*Cf.* note I.

[22]*Cf.* Jonson's words in the famous prologue to *Every Man in His Humour* regarding "language such as men do use."

[23]*T. G. of V.,* IV, 4, 1-43, and Lear, I, 4, 115.

[24]IV, 1.

[25]*II Hen. IV,* V, 1.

[26]*Don Pedro:* Good Signior Leonato, you are come to meet your trouble; the fashion of the world is to avoid cost, and you encounter it.

Leonato: Never came trouble to my house in the likeness of your Grace: for trouble being gone, comfort should remain; when you depart from me, sorrow abides, and happiness takes his leave.

Don Pedro: You embrace your charge too willingly. (*M. A. A. N.,* I, 1, 94.)

[27]*Camillo:* I think, this coming summer the King of Sicilia means to pay Bohemia the visitation which he justly owes him.

Archidamus: Wherein our entertainment shall shame us we will be justified in our loves; for indeed ——

Camillo: Beseech you, ——

Archidamus: Verily, I speak it in the freedom of my knowledge; we cannot with such magnificence —— in so rare —— I know not what to say. We will give you sleepy drinks, that your senses, unintelligent of our insufficiencie, may, though they cannot praise us, as little accuse us. (*W. T.,* I, 1, 5.)

[28]*M. A. A. N.,* I, 115-144, and many later scenes.

[29]See note 4.

[30]A whoreson tisick, a whoseson rascally tisick, so troubles me, and the foolish fortune of this girl; and what one thing, what another, that I shall leave you one o' these days: and I have a rheum in mine eyes too, and such an ache in my bones that, unless a man were cursed, I cannot tell what to think on't.—What says she there? (*T. and C.,* V, 3, 101.)

[31]That skull had a tongue in it, and could sing once; how the knave jowls it to the ground, as if it were Cain's jaw-bone that did the first murder! It might be the pate of a politician, which this ass now o'er-reaches; one that would circumvent God, might it not? (*Ham.,* V, 1, 79.)

[32]Out, damned spot! out, I say! One: two: why, then 'tis time to do't. Hell is murky. Fie, my lord, fie! a soldier, and afeard? What need we fear who knows it, when none can call our power to account? Yet who would have thought the old man to have had so much blood in him? (*Mac.,* V, 1, 36.)

[33]O' the t'other side, the policy of those crafty swearing rascals, that stale old mouse-eaten dry cheese, Nestor, and that same dog-fox, Ulysses, is not proved worth a blackberry. They set me up in policy that mongrel cur, Ajax, against that god of as bad a kind, Achilles: and now is the cur Ajax prouder than the cur Achilles, and will not arm to-day; whereupon the Grecians begin to proclaim barbarism, and policy grows into an ill opinion. (*T. and C.,* V, 4, 7.)

[34]Her passions are made of nothing but the finest parts of pure love: we cannot call her winds and waters sighs and tears; they are greater storms and tempests than almanacs can report: this cannot be cunning in her; if it be, she makes a shower of rain as well as Jove. (*A. and C.,* I, 2, 148.)

[35]W. T., I, 1, and V, 2.

[36]How malicious is my fortune, that I must repent to be just! This is the letter he spoke of, which approves him an intelligent party to the advantages of France. O heavens! that his treason were not, or not I the detector (*Lear,* III, 5, 7.)

THE ROARING BOY IN TUDOR AND STUART LITERATURE

By BURTON MILLIGAN

ALTHOUGH roaring boys are frequently depicted in sixteenth and seventeenth-century literature, and although students of the period are familiar with them as a type, there are certain misconceptions about these bullies and roisterers which need correction. For instance, it is sometimes thought that they flourished only in Shakspere's England. No less authority than the *New England Dictionary* defines roaring boys as "riotous fellows of the time of Elizabeth and James I";[1] but very little investigation is needed to show that they were numerous much earlier and much later than the designated period, as well as during it. Both literary and historical evidence shows that they were a familiar type from the early sixteenth century to the late seventeenth century. Another misconception has to do with the criminal and social status of roaring boys. Because in literature roaring boys are not infrequently depicted as petty thieves and swindlers masking their nefarious activities under pretensions to gallantry and fashion, some commentators have been misled, I believe, into assuming that thievery and the pretended character of a gentleman are as definitely typical of the roaring boys as roistering, bullying, and vandalism. For instance, Mr. Boughner, writing of "Pistol and the Roaring Boys," in a valuable article, seems to make this assumption, when he says that

> Pistol's ups and downs form a slice-of-life picture of the roaring boy, who on his more respectable side is a follower of the fashions and a pretender to gentlemanly attributes, but on his seamier side is the petty thief and haunter of the tavern and brothel.[2]

As I hope to demonstrate, the fact of the matter seems to be that during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the term *roaring boy* was applied, rather indiscriminately, to two classes of persons: (1) boisterous young gentlemen, who often behaved in an ungentlemanly manner, quarreling in taverns, breaking windows of houses of prostitution, and bullying innocent pedestrians; and (2) petty swindlers, who imitated the "fashionable" excesses of such young bloods as cloak to more serious misdemeanors.

The following discussion attempts not only to present evidence corrective of the misconceptions which I have noted, but also to establish from literary and historical sources the conventionalized description and characteristic behavior of roaring boys.

Interesting as an early reference to roaring boys are Barclay's lines in *The Ship of Fools* (1509):

> Some other Folys range about by nyght
> Prowdeley Jettynge as men myndeles or wode
> To seke occasyon with pacyent men to fyght,
> Delytynge them in shedynge mennys blode
> Outher els in spoylynge of other mennys gode.
> Let these folys, with suche lyke and semblable
> Drawe to this barge, here shall they bere a bable.[3]

Significantly, Barclay stresses the fact that the bullies are "Folys" and "men myndeles or wode"; he does not, certainly, imply that they are either thieves or professional criminals.

Of later references that I have observed, the greater number indicate that the typical offences of roaring boys were quarrelsomeness in taverns and ordinaries, drunkenness, insolence to pedestrians and officers of the law, blasphemy, vandalism, and lechery. Drunkenness seems, indeed, to have been the cause of most of the other offences, if no adequate excuse for them. Edward Guilpin's *Skialetheia* (1598) makes this point clear in a thumbnail sketch of the behavior of roarers at ordinaries:

> You goe a knot to Bloom his Ordinary,
> Friends and glad fellows all now; by and by
> Thei'le be by the eares, vie stabs, exchange disgraces,
> And bandie daggers at each other's faces.[4]

The same sort of quarrelsomeness at ordinaries, after drinking bouts, was common in the Restoration, as the following quotation from *The Nicker Nicked* (1669) shows; the writer emphasizes the good humor of the gallants on their arrival at the ordinary:

> Then, before two hours are at an end, some one has been heated with wine or made cholerick with loss of his money, [he] raises a quarrel, swords are drawn, and perhaps the boxes and candlesticks thrown at one another; and all the house [is] in a garboil, forming a perfect type of hell.[5]

Sometimes, of course, these affrays amounted to more than bluster, and culminated in stabbings and murders. In Martin Parker's "The Libertine's Conversion" (*c.* 1628) a roaring boy sadly recalls the injury he received in a tavern brawl:

> At pot and pipe I lost mine eye
> In quarrell, most unluckily.[6]

On the streets, especially late at night after protracted carousals, these roisterers insulted or attacked solitary pedestrians, beat up watchmen, and broke windows. Of many descriptions of their vandalism on such occasions, none is more spirited and colorful than that in *The Character of a Town-Gallant* (1675):

> And when they vouchsafe to Ramble homewards about One or Two o'Clock in the morning, they set up the dreadful Sa! sa! more dangerous to meet than an Indian Running a Muck. In the Heroic humours hath many a Watchman had his Horns [*i.e.,* lanthorne] Battered about his Ears; and the trembling Constable been put besides the Gravity of his Interrogations, and forced to measure his Length upon the Ground. The first man they meet they swear to Kill, and set all the women on their Heads; and so they proceed till the rattling of Broken Glass Windows, the shrieks of distressed Damsels, and the Thunder of their own Oaths and Execrations, fills all the Neighbourhood with horror, and makes their verily conclude, that the Devil and all his Life Guards are going a Processioning.[7]

Even when their humours were less "Heroic," these rogues were annoying to pedestrians, particularly in crowding them off the walks.

> If they be three to one they'le have the wall,

wrote Brathwaite,[8] making an accusation reiterated by others. By all accounts, roaring boys did indeed drink so prodigiously that their behavoir after drinking bouts was hardly remarkable. Wither's *Abuses Stript and Whipt* (1613) states that

> they will drinke ye
> From morne till night, from night till morne againe,
> Emptying themselues like Conduits, and remaine
> Ready for more still. Earth drinkes not the showres
> Faster than their infernall throats deuours
> Wine and strong liquours.[9]

Their profanity likewise drew rebuke from more than one

satirist. Rowlands, for instance, writing "A Roaring Boyes Description" in *A Paire of Spy-Knaves* (*c.* 1620), said:

> God's name is never in their mouthes, or hearts,
> Unless by oaths, to teare him out in parts,
> Blasphemously abusing his dread name,
> And hating those that doe reprove the same.[10]

The author of *The Nicker Nicked* (1669) took particular exception to this blasphemy, of which he gave some specific and amusing examples:

> Blasphemy, drunkenness, and swearing are here [at an ordinary] so familiar, that civility is, by the rule of contrarieties, accounted a vice. I do not mean swearing, when there is occasion to attest a truth, but no occasion, as 'God damn me, how dost?' 'What a clock is it, by God?'[11]

Similarly, the broadside ballad "The Cheating Age" (*c.* 1626), describing a roarer, mentions

> The terrible oathes which for nothing he sware.[12]

The lechery of roaring boys was proverbial. According to Lodge, the "daily exercise" of one of these bullies was "to be champion in a bawdy house."[13] In *Measure for Measure* Pompey, servant to the bawd Mistress Overdone, remarks that roaring boys are "all great doers in our trade."[14] Wither branded them as "whores' champions",[15] and Overbury called them supervisors to brothels.[16] The roaring boy in Martin Parker's "The Libertine's Conversion" (*c.* 1628) confessed that at

> Old-street end, though then a lad,
> Foure wenches at one time I had[17]

The roarer in *The Wandering Jew Telling Fortunes to Englishmen* (1649) boasts:

> Jew, I would have thee know I am a man of the sword; a Battoon Gallant, one of our Dammees, a bouncing boy, a kicker of bawds, a tyrant over punks . . . .[18]

In a lesser number of literary references, the offences attributed to roaring boys indicate that some who went by the name were indeed swindlers, thieves, and bullies of the lowest class. "In Terme time," says Lodge, writing of Brawling Contention, "he is a Setter, to further horse-stealers; and to connycatch a countryman, he shall giue place to none in Newgate. . . .[19] Shave'em, the prostitute

in Massinger's *The City Madam* (1632), accuses Ramble and Scuffle, "two swaggering, suburban roarers, Sixpenny truckers," of cutting a purse in St. Paul's at a sermon and of stealing bacon from a poor market woman.[20] The roaring boy who confesses his sins in "The Town Bully's Bravery" (*c.* 1690), says:

> A Pocket I can pick with the very best alive,

and adds:

> Sometimes I am mounted upon dapple gray,
> To take a Purse or so upon the King's Highway,
> With a Pistol in my hand, and the word is D— Stand,
> Likewise Deliver, then they quiver, yield to my demand.[21]

Pettier cheats, such as refuse to pay reckonings at taverns, are also mentioned by satirists. "The Town Bully's Bravery" gives a particularly unpleasant and, no doubt, realistic picture of the way these blustering bullies made tavern attendants cringe, and yet would "seldom pay at all."[22] Some of the roarers, it also appears, were among the sharpers who gambled and cheated at cards and dice. Have-at-all, the roaring boy in Cartwright's *The Ordinary* (1634), says:

> I do but think how I
> Shall bastinado o'er the ordinaries.
> Arm'd with my sword, battoon and foot, I'll walk
> To give each rank its due. No one shall 'scape
> But he I win of.[23]

Yet another roguery of certain roaring boys of the more disreputable type was the making of deceptive and boastful claims about military service. The motives for such claims, one may surmise, were not only the desire of the bullies to appear brave and fearsome, but also their wish to take on a color of respectability and gentility—to play the part of swaggering young gentlemen. Fraudulent boasts of military service are held up to scorn in the broadside ballad "I Know What I know" (*c.* 1620):

> There be many Rorers,
> that swagger and rore
> As though they in th' warres had been
> seuen yeeres and more;
> And yet they neuer lookt
> in the face of a foe;
> They seeme gallant sparkes,
> but I know what I know.[24]

The idea of the roaring boys as mere thugs, criminals, and professional bullies of the lowest sort is reinforced, it must be added, by many characterizations of them in plays—for instance, Kastril in Jonson's *The Alchemist;* Val Cutting in his *Bartholomew Fair;* Warbeck, in Ford, Dekker, and Rowley's *The Witch of Edmonton;* Matheo in Dekker's *The Honest Whore,* Part II; Ruffman in Heywood's *The Fair Maid of the West;* Ramble and Scuffle in Massinger's *The City Madam;* Have-at-all and Slicer in Cartwright's *The Ordinary;* and Captain Hackum in Shadwell's *The Squire of Alsatia.* In such characterizations, it must be admitted, there is little suggestion of the young gentlemen or aristocrat who occasionally indulges in an evening of debauchery and riot. Perhaps they, especially, have tended to narrow the modern student's conception of the roaring boy.

When one seeks historical parallels to the literary references to roaring boys and their wild conduct, one finds a number of them. Such accounts as the following, by Luttrell, are not uncommon:

> The 13th [of January, 1681/2], at night, some young gentlemen of the Temple went to the Kings Head tavern in Chancery lane, committing strange outrages there, breaking of windows, &c., which the watch hearing off [*sic*], came up to disperse them; but they sending for severall of the watermen with halberts that attend their comptroller at the revells, were engaged in a desperate riott, in which one of the watchmen was run through the body with an halbert, and lies very ill; but the watchmen secured one or two of the watermen.[25]

That the offenders on this occasion were not professional criminals or thugs, but "young gentlemen of the Temple," is worth remarking. Similarly, the behavior of Wyatt and Surrey, in 1543, when they were arrested for smashing windows with a stonebow,[26] was undoubtedly that of many other young gallants who were not habitual criminals. Also resembling the affrays of roaring boys but not involving professional criminals were the tavern quarrel at Deptford, in 1593, in which Ingram Frizer murdered Marlowe; the duel, in 1598, in which Ben Jonson killed his fellow actor Gabriel Spencer; the street brawl in which Sir George Etherege and Rochester were involved at Epsom, in 1676, and in which one of their companions was killed. Evidence of this sort should, however, by no means militate against

the conclusion that there were many roaring boys who were habitual criminals. It is a well established fact that bullies of this type not only existed in great number, but that some of them became members of criminal fraternities like the Tityre-tues of the seventeenth century and the Mohocks of the early eighteenth century.[27]

Champaign, Illinois.

---

[1]Under *boy,* sb. 6.

[2]D. C. Boughner, "Pistol and the Roaring Boys," *Shakespeare Association Bulletin,* XI (1936), 227. Cf., p. 237, the statement that Pistol "is clearly modeled after a common Elizabethan type, the roaring boy, whose characteristics he displays. . . ."

[3]Ed. Jamieson, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1874), I, 299. That Barclay was not in this passage merely translating from the German original, Brant's *Narrenschiff,* but that he was consciously describing English conditions, has been pointed out by Pompen, *The English Versions of 'The Ship of Fools'* (New York, 1925), pp. 241-242. The lines that I have quoted occur in one of three stanzas marked "Addicio translatoris Alexandri barclay" and replace lines in the original not appropriate to England. According to Griffiths, *The Chronicles of Newgate,* 2 vols. (London, 1884), I, 29, a man named Elmer de Multone was indicted as a "rorere" in 1311.

[4]*Skialetheia: or a Shadow of Truth in certain Epigrams,* ed. Grosart (Manchester, 1878), p. 60.

[5]*Harleian Miscellany,* VII, 362.

[6]*Roxburghe Ballads,* ed. Chappell and Ebsworth, 9 vols. (London, 1871), III, 125. cf., in *Measure for Measure,* IV, iii, 13-15, the clown Pompey's reference, when he sees a group of roisterers in prison, to "Master Starve-lackey the rapier and dagger-man, and young Drop-heir that killed lusty Pudding."

[7]*The Old Book Collector's Miscellany,* ed. Hindley, 3 vols. (London, 1873), II, 7-8. Cf. Captain Hackum's speech in Shadwell's *The Squire of Alsatia* (1688), I, i: "We had fiddles, whores, scoured, broke windows, beat watches, and roared like thunder."

[8]*A Strappado for the Divell,* ed. Ebsworth (Boston, Lincolnshire, 1878), p. 52.

[9]*Juvenilia,* 2 vols. (Spenser Society, 1871), I, 243.

[10]*Complete Works of Samuel Rowlands,* 3 vols. (Glasgow, 1880), II, 15.

[11]*Harleian Miscellany,* VII, 362.

[12]*A Pepysian Garland,* ed. Rollins (Cambridge University Press, 1922), p. 245.

[13]*Complete Works,* 4 vols. (Hunterian Club, 1883), IV, 63.

[14]IV, iii, 20.

[15]*Juvenilia,* I, 243.

[16]*Miscellaneous Works,* ed. Rimbault (London, 1856), p. 122.

[17]*Roxburghe Ballads,* III, 125.

[18]*A Book of Characters,* ed. Aldington (New York, n. d.), p. 383.

[19]*Works,* IV, 63.

[20]III, i.

[21]*Pepys Ballads,* ed. Rollins, 6 vols. (Harvard University Press, 1929-1931), V, 285-286.

[22]*Ibid.,* V, 285.

[23]II, i.

[24]*Roxburghe Ballads,* I, 120. *Cf.* Brathwaite's statement in regard to roaring boys, *A Strappado for the Divell,* ed. Ebsworth, p. 52:

> Buffe-yerkins say their souldiers, (but's not so,)
> For they were prest indeed but durst not goe.

[25]*A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs,* 6 vols. (Oxford, 1857), I, 158.

[26]Bapst, *Deux Gentilshommes-Poetes* (Paris, 1891), pp. 267-268. On at least two other occasions they had created miniature riots, once by running amuck with their stonebow in the prostitute quarter of Southwark.

[27]T. S. Graves, "Some Pre-Mohock Clansmen," *Studies in Philology,* XX (1923), 396.

A NOTE ON 2 HENRY IV

By RUSSELL K. ALSPACH

IN *A Collection of Poems . . . with Notes* (Dublin, 1792-4), Samuel Whyte (1733-1811) gives a source for *2 Henry IV,* V, 2, 112-117, that has hitherto escaped notice. Whyte was a Dublin pedagogue and litterateur who conducted for over fifty years a seminary for young ladies and young gentlemen at 75 Gratton Street.[1] His influence and ability as a teacher were attested by his pupil, Thomas Moore, who spoke of Whyte as "at the head of his profession in [Dublin] . . . [I owe] . . . to that exalted person all the instruction in English literature [I] have ever received."[2] No one ever praised Whyte's standing as a poet, nor is it likely that anyone ever will. But he liked to dabble in criticism, and among his critical observations is the one mentioned above. He remarks that Shakspere "has him [Henry V], having ascended the throne of his deceased father, in a friendly expostulation with the man who had committed him, restoring him to office, with these remarkable words:

> You did commit me:
> For which I do commit into your hand
> The unstain'd sword that you have used to bear;
> With this remembrance,—*that you use the same*
> *With the like bold, just and impartial spirit*
> *As you have done 'gainst me.*

"The very idea of Ulpius Trajan, the 13th Roman Emperor, who, at his inauguration, when he delivered, according to custom, the sword to the chief of the Prætorium, added,

> *Hoc pro me si juste imperavero, si perperam contra me utere.*[3]

Although the parallel is not perfect, the similarity is sufficiently marked to give point to Whyte's comment. The ceremony of presenting the sword was in both cases symbolic; and it seems reasonable to believe that Shakspere had Trajan's gesture and words in mind.

Whyte does not say where he found his quotation, and it is possible that he wrote from memory. He may have run across the story in any one of a number of places. The chief sources for it are Pliny the Younger, *Panegyricus,* 67; Victor, *De Caesaribus,* 13; and Dion Cassius, *History of*

Rome (Greek), 68. It is found also in Zonaras, *Compendium of History* (Greek), Bk. II; Xiphilinus the Younger, *Epitome of Dion Cassius* (Greek); and Suidas, *Lexicon* (Greek). These were all available to Shakspere; in the cases of Dion, Zonaras, Xiphilinus, and Suidas, in Latin translation from Greek. In no one of the sources mentioned are Whyte's exact words used; Xiphilinus is the closest: *"Hoc pro me utaris, si bene imperavero: sin secus, contra me."*

Or he may have remembered the story from Milton, who makes use of it three times; and Milton, among the English poets, was Whyte's idol.[24] Milton's first use is in *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates,* where he quotes Trajan's words in English, " 'Take this drawn sword,' saith he, 'to use for me, if I reign well; if not, to use against me.' " [ed. Symmons, 2, 280]! the second, in his *Defensio* [Prima] *Pro Populo Anglicano,* where he quotes them in Latin, *" 'Accipe hunc gladium pro me, si recte agam, sin aliter, in me magio . . . ' "* [ed. Symmons, 5, 145]. These words are a combination of Aurelius Victor and Dion Cassius. And, third, again in *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates,* though he does not speak of the Trajan parallel, he quotes the inscription stamped on the first coins struck in Scotland after the coronation of James VI: *" 'Si mereor, in me.' "* [ed. Symmons, II, 293].[5]

Perhaps Whyte's exact source is undiscoverable; probably there is none, or it is a combination of many. But if he is correct in his assumption that, when Henry goes through the symbolical act of committing into the hand of the Lord Chief-Justice the "unstained sword that you have us'd to bear," Shakspere had Trajan's symbolism in mind, then we have not only a source for the lines discussed, but also a hint that Shakspere had a wider knowledge of Latin literature than has been supposed.

University of Pennsylvania.

---

[1] *DNB.*

[2] Thomas Moore, *Memoirs of Richard Brinsley Sheridan,* London, 1827, I, 3.

[3] Preface, pp. XXXII-XXXIII, to "The Theatre," a poem Whyte had published in 1790 and which he republished, together with a long preface, in *A Collection of Poems.*

[4] See my forthcoming note in *MLN,* "A Dublin Milton Enthusiast."

[5] The whole inscription was *"Pro Me. Si Mereor. In Me."* Milton's mention of this inscription was noted by Berge in his "Essais sur le rêgne de Trajan," in *Bibliothëque de L'école Des Hautes Etudes,* Paris, 1877, 32, 84, n.